# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 132 968 HE 008 685

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Hanford, George H. |
| TITLE | The Need for a National Study of Intercollegiate Athletics. A Report to the American Council on Education. Volume 2. Appendices. |
| INSTITUTION | American Council on Education, Washington, D.C. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.; Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y. |
| PUB DATE | 22 Mar 74 |
| NOTE | 420p.; For related document, see HE 008 514 |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.83 HC-$22.09 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Athletes; *Athletic Programs; *Athletics; Court Litigation; Females; Financial Problems; Football; *Higher Education; *Intercollegiate Programs; *Needs Assessment; Negroes; Policy Formation; Politics |

ABSTRACT

The nine appendixes of the feasibility study include: (1) current litigation involving intercollegiate athletics: analysis and implications (Carlos Alvarez); (2) financial problems of intercollegiate athletics (Robert H. Atwell); (3) the state politics (Jerry Beasley); (4) report of the task force on the black athlete (Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.); (5) sports and the postsecondary sector (Joseph Froomkin); (6) new and changing circumstances influencing the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs since 1930 (Bernard P. Ireland); (7) campus, society, and the place of amateur sport (Theodore J. Lowi); (8) women in intercollegiate athletics (Mary McKeown); and (9) the experience of senior colleges that have discontinued football (Felix Springer). (Author/MSE)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED132968

VOLUME II

# A report to the AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION

on

# THE NEED FOR A NATIONAL STUDY OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

## APPENDICES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE008685

APPENDIX A

# CURRENT LITIGATION INVOLVING INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS: ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE SPORTS

Carlos Alvarez
Second Year Law Student
Duke Law School

The place of college athletics in American life has rapidly expanded since its quiet beginning in the mid 19th century. With this growth, it has acquired many of the problems which a business of its magnitude and influence is bound to encounter. Not surprisingly, in recent years several areas within intercollegiate athletics have had to rely on the legal system to resolve conflicts which internal institutions have been unable to ameliorate. This article attempts to acquaint the reader with these areas and the problems involved. In addition, it presents one section which this writer believes to be the next major source of litigation.

The paper is divided into four sections: First Amendment litigation; suits involving student-athlete and member institutions against the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA); cases dealing with injuries in intercollegiate athletics; finally, the area of sex discrimination in amateur athletics--perhaps the next subject matter in intercollegiate athletic litigation.

## FIRST AMENDMENT LITIGATION

The rise in the mood of protest on American college campuses throughout the 1960's is well documented. Less clear is the extent to which the athletic programs of these institutions must attempt to accommodate this movement and the impact which it will have on the disciplinary authority of the officials in these programs. The need for athletic programs to adjust to these developments arises from the First Amendment to the United States Constitution which, inter alia, guarantees every citizen freedom of speech and association. While it is judicially well established that these freedoms are not absolutes, and their protection will vary under the circumstances, they nevertheless are given the highest judicial protection from governmental interference. To the extent that college athletes indulge in freedom of expression and association, any restraint by college officials on their actions must be consistent with the judicial guidelines which protect these First Amendment rights in an educational setting.

Up until 1971, there had been no legal actions brought by student-athletes participating in college athletics based on First Amendment grounds. The cause of such a scarcity of litigation can be attributed to a number of reasons, none of which seem satisfactory in and of themselves.[1] At the present there is only one case, Williams v. Eaton,[2] dealing directly with the area of First Amendment rights to student-athletes at the university level. Nevertheless, since only as recently as 1969 in Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District[3] the Supreme Court of the United States took a definitive position on the application of First Amendment rights to students, it seems probable that this area will soon see further litigation.

As noted, the leading case on First Amendments rights to student-athletes to date is Williams v. Eaton, an action in which fourteen University of Wyoming football players claimed a violation of their freedom of speech. In Eaton, the fourteen players sought to wear black arm bands during their game with Brigham Young University so as to demonstrate their disfavor with Brigham Young's ties with the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (commonly known as the Mormon Church). Their protest was directed at the official policy of the Mormon Church of restricting to the lower official ranks black participation in the church community.

The demand to wear black arm bands was initially brought to head football coach Floyd Eaton. At the time they were informed by Coach Eaton of their dismissal from any further athletic participation since they had violated a football coaching rule prohibiting all demonstrations and protect. An appeal from this ruling was brought before President William D. Carlson of the University of Wyoming who subsequently referred the matter to the Board of Trustees. After a hearing at which all interested parties took part, the Board of Trustees, following the refusal of the athletes to refrain from their intention to wear black arm bands at the Brigham Young game, ordered the dismissal of all fourteen players from the football squad. Their scholarships, however, were not revoked and remained in full effect subject to later review.

The student-athletes relied on Tinker v. Des Moines Independent School District[4] for their freedom of speech claim. Tinker was the first case by the Supreme Court of the United States dealing with student's free speech rights since the 1943 compulsory flag salute case,[5] and it upheld the right of public school students to wear black arm bands during school hours to protest the Vietnam War. The Court described the student's actions as "a silent, passive, expression of opinion, unaccompanied by a disorder or disturbance on the part of petitioners" constituting "pure speech" involving "direct, primary First Amendment rights."[6] In order to provide some future guidance in this area, the Court articulated the basic standard to be used:

> A student's rights do not embrace merely the classroom hours. When he is in the cafeteria, or on the playing field, or on the campus during the authorized hours he may express his opinion, even on controversial subjects like the conflict in Vietnam, if he does so without 'materially and substantially interfer[ing] with the requirements of appropriate discipline in the operation of the school' and without colliding with the rights of others . . . .
>
> . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . .
>
> . . . . We read [the right to free speech] to permit reasonable regulation of speech-connected activities in carefully restricted circumstances. But we do not confine the permissible exercise of First Amendment rights to a telephone booth, or to supervised and ordained discussion in a classroom.[7]

Given that their action constituted speech, the student-athletes argued their activity fell within the parameters of Tinker since their action would not affect the orderly process of the educational system nor interfere with the rights of others. State officials, however, saw the question not in terms of Tinker but rather that the student-athlete's protest constituted action by the state and subject to the First Amendment Establishment of Religion Clause. Since one of the Constitutional mandates of this clause requires actions by the state to be neutral in matters concerning religion, the act of the athletes showing disfavor of the Mormon Church would constitute a violation. It followed therefore, that preemptive measures by state officials to stop the acts were proper in light of their Constitutional obligation.

The Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals did not agree with either position in their pure form, ultimately extracting portions of both while holding for the state officials. Although it agreed with the student-athletes that Tinker was determinative, it took the postulate of state officials of a violation of the establishment clause and applied it to the Tinker standard. In essence, the Court determined that Tinker did not allow speech in an educational setting where the "rights of others" were interfered with. Applying the facts of the case to this standard, the court found the black arm band display would result in hostile expression of religious thought to "others," equating this with violation of the "rights of others."

> Without deciding whether approval of the arm band display would have involved state action or a violation of the religious clauses, we are persuaded that the Trustees' decision was lawful within the limitation of the Tinker case itself. Their decision protested against invasion of the rights of others by avoiding a hostile expression to them by some members of the University team. It was in furtherance of religious neutrality by the state. It denied only the request for the armband display . . . on the field and during the game. In these limited circumstances we conclude that the Trustees' decision was in conformity with the Tinker case . . . .[8]

The value of Eaton as precedent in the area of First Amendment Freedoms is mixed. Although its holding clearly applies the Tinker case to the student-athlete--university athletic program setting, its application of the facts to the Tinker standard is questionable. By not answering the issue of state action,[9] the court's analysis must stand on the grounds of a student seeking to exercise his speech rights on the athletic field. In order to prohibit such speech, the university officials must demonstrate under Tinker that the expression either "materially and substantially" disrupted the "discipline in the operation of the school" or that the "rights of others" were interfered with. The first prong of the Tinker standard could not be met because of the lower court finding of fact that there had been no showing of "violence or disruption" in the case.[10] In attempting to meet the second part of Tinker the court in effect found the "rights of others" interfered with by private individuals protesting policies of a particular religion. Such "hostile expression" by members of the team, the court reasoned, was abridged in "furtherance of the policy of religious neutrality by the state." At this juncture the court's reasoning falters. By previously refusing to decide whether there had been state action involved, the court took away all its underpinnings on how this policy could have been made in furtherance of religious neutrality. However, even if the state action had been answered affirmatively, the rational of the decision would still be open to criticism.[11]

Notwithstanding the defective analysis and of greater saliency for the present purpose, the Eaton case crystallizes the advent of First Amendment rights application to student-athletes at institutions of higher learning. While Tinker is clearly the landmark case in the area, Eaton, in applying Tinker to the facts before it, recognizes that student-athletes have protection from abridgment of First Amendment freedoms through the Tinker standard. Of special relevance in future years will be the speech and assembly freedoms as student-athletes have become more boisterous and concerned about their rights during their tenure at the University level. Any action taken by school officials against student-athletes while the latter indulge in these protected rights will ultimately require a valid rationale under Tinker.

Although the Eaton case dealt with a demonstration evolving out of a specific racial-religious conflict, future student-athletes are likely to privately and publicly expound their views on political matters, university policies, personal philosophies and a number of other interests. An example of the varied context in which litigation in this area is likely to arise is presented in the recent problems which Auburn University's athletic department encountered when it forbade black athletes to wear facial hair.[12] The athletes refused to shave claiming this aspect of their personal grooming as a legitimate individual prerogative as well as a demonstration of racial pride. Without asserting any rationale for its ruling, except the implied belief that authority must be oebyed in order to have successful athletic teams, the athletic department threatened all the black student-athletes with suspension. Yet this disciplinary step might not have passed Constitutional screening under Tinker. The wearing of facial hair by the students for the purpose they had indicated, seems to fall under the parameters of First Amendment "speech" as developed by the Supreme Court. If litigation had ensued,[13] Auburn University would have had to assert some valid rationale under Tinker. In effect, the court would have been prone to inquire what disruption of "appropriate discipline of the operation" of athletic programs is threatened by the facial hair?

In turn, this inquiry serves as the springboard to the ultimate key issue which lies at the core of the Tinker standard and which the Williamson court chose to bypass, namely, what "disruption" in the athletic program will have to be proven before a student-athlete's First Amendment Rights can be restricted? The issue does not lend itself to broad and simple judicial solution and will probably be resolved by a case by case approach. Although to venture any predictions in the area is hazardous, some observations on the probably overall approach can be proffered. Since the Tinker rationale does permit for the circumstances of each case to be taken into account, the standard for athletic programs is likely to allow for greater leeway, because of its special setting, than the general university community. Nevertheless, if athletic officials are content to fall back on the special circumstances approach and voice any rationale for their restrictions they are clearly mistaken. With the mandate of Tinker, courts will not allow speech and assembly rights of student-athletes to be restricted by vague, unsubstantiated arguments such as: team morale would be impaired; there is a need for strong authoritarian rule in some sports; the concentration of team members will be hampered. Tinker seems to demand more; how much more is difficult to pinpoint.

Again, the problems of Auburn University's Athletic Department presents a good case to expound on these premises. Under the special circumstances of a football team, a player wearing hair under his chin would create a safety hazard to himself because of the need to wear a well-adjusted chinstrap, thus the regulation would seem valid under Tinker. On the other hand, there would seem to be no safety problem created with the same athlete wearing a mustache or a tack and field athlete wearing hair under his chin. If the athletic department in turn presents a morale, authority or concentration based argument to validate such a broad regulation, it will be faced with an uphill battle to meet the Tinker rationale.

What operative changes the Tinker case will bring about in collegiate athletic departments will depend on several factors. Initially, of course, it turns on the present regulation and attitudes of such departments towards freedom of expression and assembly. If such rules tend to be unreasonably prohibitive, the effect of Tinker will then turn on the determination of student-athletes in demanding their First Amendment rights or on how sensitive college officials are to the Tinker mandate and their willingness to change. Historically, in collegiate athletic programs, both factions have been noticeably lethargic in their actions in this area. The extent that the 1960's and early 70's have changed this pattern remains to be seen.

## CASES INVOLVING STUDENT-ATHLETES AND MEMBER INSTITUTIONS AGAINST THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION (NCAA)

By far the area of most frequent litigation in intercollegiate athletics in recent years has dealt with actions involving the NCAA against its member institutions and student-athletes. The cases have largely arisen from attempts by member schools and particularly student-athletes to prevent enforcement of NCAA regulations which would adversely affect them. Most of the litigation has involved constitutional questions of due process and equal protection of the law but there has been some ancillary issues raised based on state law and even one on grounds of libel.

In order to enforce its regulations, the NCAA uses its own official procedure. Complaints are obtained by filings of member institutions, the press, or the public at large.

Once a complaint is filed, a Committee on Infractions investigates the charges to see if it warrants an official inquiry and if so, the institution under investigation is immediately notified. Once the official inquiry is terminated the report which includes a recommendation as to what action to take is given to the Executive Council with the particular member institution being given a chance for a hearing before the Council votes on what disciplinary steps to take. A vote of two thirds of the Council is required for any disciplinary action with review allowed only if there has been prejudicial error in any of the investigatory proceedings or if newly discovered evidence is brought forth. There is no provision for student participation since it is assumed that the particular institution will adequately represent his interest.

There are two distinct categories in which most of the violations of NCAA rules and subsequent litigation have transpired. One area is the violation of rules by member institutions alone, exemplified by acts such as recruiting violations or illegal kickbacks to student-athletes. The other involves failure of a student-athlete to meet the necessary eligibility requirements imposed by the NCAA. For both of these types of violations, the NCAA will deal only with the member institutions, contending only indirectly with the student-athlete. For example, if the member institution has a recruiting violation in football, the NCAA might prohibit participation by the school in any post season bowl activity. In effect, while the school does suffer a reprimand as well as a loss of revenue and prestige, the student-athlete, an outside party in the dispute, is also penalized since he is unable to compete. On the other hand, when the NCAA has to declare a particular student-athlete ineligible because of failure to meet grade requirements, it will act through member institutions, threatening the school with sanctions ranging from reprimands to loss of membership if the athlete is not declared ineligible from further athletic competition.

Cases:

The litigation revolving around student-athletes has, on the whole, been involved with grade requirements for eligibility. In Curtis v. NCAA,[14] the NCAA declared Isaac Curtis and Larry Brumsey ineligible for further competition. The school placed them on probation because of failure of both athletes to meet the 1.600 grade point prediction[15] then required by the NCAA. Curtis and Brumsey had been permitted to enter the University of California at Berkley under a four percent minority admissions program which did not require an entrance examination unlike the NCAA's 1.600 rule. After participating for two years, excelling in both football and track as well as compiling a cumulative average higher than 3.0, both athletes were ordered to be declared ineligible for one year by the MCAA. Berkeley was penalized as well, and placed on probation for one year as of the time it declared the athletes on probation. Nevertheless, the school appealed the decision to NCAA and upon denial, the athletes brought suit claiming a violation of Due process and Equal protection of the law under the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution. The action, however, was later dropped when Curtis and Brumsey voluntarily transferred to San Diego State University.

A similar action arose at Centenary College in Parish v. NCAA.[16] In this case, five students, one of which was Centenary's outstanding basketball player, Robert Parish, were declared ineligible by the NCAA because of failure to meet the 1.600 grade point prediction requirement. Centenary College, however, refused to abide by the NCAA decision, permitting all the student-athletes to remain eligible for athletic competition. Sanctions were passed out against the school and the student-athletes, with the institution's penalty subject to reduction in the event they declared the athletes ineligible. The students took their grievance to court, charging denial of equal protection of the law under the United States Constitution claiming the 1.600 rule subjected them to requirements not demanded of other students. A temporary restraining order was obtained by the athletes against the NCAA, preventing the latter from issuing any sanctions against the athletes. Five months later, however, the same federal district court denied a permanent injunction against the NCAA holding that a "substantial federal question" had not been presented, so that the court had no jurisdiction over the dispute.[17] Nevertheless, the court went on to deal with the merits of the action and in dicta found that the 1.600 rule met the constitutional mandate of the equal protection clause.

Aside from scholastic eligibility requirements, the NCAA has also found itself in court when it has declared athletes ineligible due to misconduct. In Grant v. NCAA,[18] New Mexico State University basketball players, Roland "Tree" Grant and John Williamson, were accused by the NCAA of receiving illegal kickbacks for their basketball participation. As a result, New Mexico State was asked to declare both athletes ineligible. Subsequently, the athletes filed suit against the NCAA not only asking for an injunction to inhibit the NCAA from taking any disciplinary action, but in addition, 2.5 million dollars in damages for the alleged libel arising out of the public accusations by the NCAA. A temporary restraining order was obtained as well as a subsequent permanent injunction prohibiting the NCAA from taking any punitive action against the plaintiffs. The permanent injunction was later dissolved after the NCAA stipulated that it would take no action against either party for the duration of the 1972-73 season.

In January of 1974 two more cases arose out of NCAA termination of athletic eligibility. Emanuel Achampson and Miles Reynolds, members of Pan American University's tennis team brought suit in federal court to restrain the NCAA from banning them from intercollegiate competition.[19] The NCAA has alleged that the athletes took the entrance exam on the wrong day so they were technically not eligible to participate in collegiate athletics. Denial of due process is the central contention of the athletes' suit.

In the other litigation, Long Beach State's basketball players, Glenn McDonald and Roscoe Ponderter, were declared ineligible by the NCAA after being charged that the two had entered the University by having proxies take the entrance exam for them. Signing statements that all the allegations were untrue, both athletes brought suit in the federal district court to restrain the NCAA from terminating their eligibility.[20] Again their suit revolved around denial of due process of law. A temporary restraining order has been obtained by the student-athletes enabling them to continue to play for the basketball team, at least until the deliberations at a "show cause" hearing have been completed. At this hearing, the NCAA must come forward and show why both of these players should not be reinstated on the Long Beach State basketball team.

This amount of litigation must not obscure the fact that student-athletes are subject to suspension if they break regulations which meet all Constitutional standards. The concern in all of these cases deals mostly with the procedure which must be afforded the student-athlete in such a suspension and in a few instances, the Constitutional substantive requirement the regulation should meet. A clear expression of what the issue in these cases is and what is needed for a ruling affecting the athlete to meet Constitutional standards is set out in Behagen v. Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Representatives.[21] There, the University of Minnesota out of its own initiative suspended one of its basketball players for causing a fight at one of the games. The student-athlete sought an injunction to prevent the school from enforcing the suspension but the action failed. While allowing the institutions to withhold eligibility in certain circumstances, the Court gave a stern warning that the right of due process must not be taken away from the athlete. As the Court saw it, "interests in participation in athletics are so substantial that they cannot be impaired without proceedings which comply with minimum standards of due process." Accordingly, the Court allowed the suspension for a limited period of time after which it would be invalid unless the student-athlete was given a hearing; such a hearing to comply with the minimum standards established by the Court.[22]

As far as individual institutions bringing legal suits against the NCAA's sanctioning procedure, there are only two reported cases. Perhaps the reason for the lack of litigation is the fact that the individual institutions are given notice and a hearing, they voluntarily join the NCAA and any litigation is destined to bring unwanted publicity to an institution whose reputation has already been marred by the NCAA public announcement of the penalty. Of the two cases, one was brought in conjunction with the Curtis action against the NCAA and following Curtis and Brumsey's enrollment in another institution, the action became moot.[23]

The other case perhaps represents one of the few instances where member institutions would feel litigation could serve a useful purpose. In Board of Education for the State of Louisiana v. NCAA,[24] the University of Southwestern Louisiana (USL) sought to prevent the NCAA from imposing or enforcing any sanction on it. According to the NCAA, USL had committed 120 infractions of rules established by the NCAA, most of them dealing with recruiting violations and illegal kickbacks to basketball players. Because USL's basketball team was ranked high and had ultimate hopes of a post season tournament invitation which could lead to the national championship, USL sought to forestall any NCAA sanctions, one of which might prohibit the basketball team from tournament participation. USL therefore, sought relief in the form of an injunction restricting the NCAA from taking any action in the matter until August 15, 1973. The reason given for such a delay was anchored on the argument that USL needed more time to respond to the 120 charges leveled against itself and the student-athletes involved. USL also asserted that they were the target of a disruption campaign by other athletically oriented institutions within the State. The contention was that USL's fast rise to prominence in basketball gave rise to a desire on the part of other state schools to bring them back down. In addition, USL intimated that because of the number of black athletes on its basketball team, strong segregation sentiment around the State had made up unfounded rumors in order to injure USL's athletic program.

In the end, USL achieved its main objective. Although the Third Court of Appeals of the State of Louisiana overturned the trial court's restraining order against the NCAA, the Supreme Court of the State of Louisiana allowed the original trial court's order to stand. USL was invited to the NCAA tournament but was quickly eliminated (a situation which leads one to conclude that what a law court was unable to do, a basketball court could do quite well). As was expected, USL dropped the litigation after the tournament and was subsequently penalized by the NCAA by loss of membership.

Substantive Law Requirements:

The substantive basis of actions brought by member institutions against the NCAA are either on procedural grounds (i.e., insufficient time to prepare a case) or state law which varies with each jurisdiction. Because of the narrow scope of these actions, their substantive requirements will not be dealt with; suffice to note that such actions do exist. Also, it is important to bear in mind that some of the issues which follow regarding student-athlete litigation could apply to suits of member institutions against the NCAA, for reasons which will become apparent.

## Substantive Law Requirements for actions brought by student-athletes:

In order to be successful in his litigation, an athlete-plaintiff must show three things: an interest substantial enough to require Constitutional protection; action affecting such an "interest" by a governmental body, either state or federal (state action); such action must transgress Constitutional parameters. The three areas will be considered in the above order.

Does a student's interest in participating in college sports rise to the status of an interest substantial enough to be entitled to Constitutional protection? An affirmative response seems appropriate and supportable under judicial interpretations. All student-athletes have one or more of three interests which arguably are substantial enough to require Fourteenth Amendment due process or equal protection safeguards. In the sports which have a counterpart in the professional world, a number of student-athletes have an interest in bettering both their competitive skills as well as their bargaining position in future dealings with professional teams. An athlete who has had public exposure along with a sharpening of athletic talent in top class competition is in a much better position to demand a favorable professional contract. For all athletes, the payment of educational costs represents the major interest. A loss of financial assistance due to NCAA ineligibility can cause great hardship, even to the point of forfeiting a college education. Finally, the chance for publicity and recognition as well as the possibility of attaining higher athletic goals such as the Olympics constitute yet another interest to the student-athlete. This acclaim will prove invaluable in whatever field the athlete enters both in terms of opportunity and contacts. Most of the courts which have faced the issue have without much difficulty used one of these interpretations to fulfill the necessary "substantial interest."[25] Some, however, have refused to recognize that the student-athlete has any interest at stake which falls under the protective umbrella of the Fourteenth Amendment.[26]

The requirement of state action refers to the need that actions which violate Constitutional standards emanate from governmental or quasi-governmental public bodies as opposed to private parties. On this issue, there is complete unanimity among the courts that the NCAA sanctioning procedure involves state action. Although the state action requirement could be narrowly interpreted to encompass actions directly performed by state or federal government, the Supreme Court of the United States has opted for a broader standard:

> The involvement of the State need not be either exclusive or direct. In a variety of situations the Court has found state action of a nature sufficient to create rights even though the participation of the State was peripheral, or its action was only one of several co-operative forces leading to the constitutional violation.[27]

Accordingly, the Supreme Court has established three tests of state action, any of which can satisfy the requirement. Two of these, the "public function" and the "sum total of state involvement" approaches, have particular relevance to the present situation. Under the "public function" approach when private individuals or groups perform activities which are basically governmental, they become "agencies of the state and subject to its constitutional limitations."[28] In Parish v. NCAA this test was applied in the following fashion:

> Although NCAA is a nationwide association, it does control public schools which are State agencies to the extent that the high school athletic associations control their respective members at least insofar as regulations, sanctions, and discipline are concerned. Moreover, State funds are used by public schools to pay membership dues to the association.
> Therefore, we must and do conclude that there definitely is State action . . . .[29]

Where no specific "public function" can be articulated, courts often turn to the "sum total of state involvement" approach to find state action. Here, the focus is on the whole involvement of the state in the private activity to see if a minimum level of state function is met thereby triggering the factor of state action. In the instant problem, the state is extensively involved in the suppprt, control and regulations of the institutions the NCAA controls. In addition, State owned facilities are frequently utilized as forums for NCAA activities, State funds in the form of dues are paid to the NCAA and State employees take part in

NCAA functions. The sum of this state involvement presented above has been found sufficient to satisfy the need for state action.[30]

The substantive questions involved in most of the instant litigation deal with either due process or equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. The rights guaranteed by the due process clause which are pertinent to the NCAA sanctioning process are termed procedural due process. Basically, this protection assures that citizens will not be deprived of life, liberty or property without notice and a subsequent fair hearing being granted to the aggrieved party. Obviously, the standard of review varies in accordance with the gravity of the proceeding--a criminal action will require more procedural safeguards than a civil action for property damage. Nevertheless, among the specifics of the requirement applicable to most cases[31] are: ability to confront and cross examine adverse witnesses at a hearing; timely notice of charges leveled against the individual; a fair and impartial trier of facts; a right to be represented by counsel; a decision based on the facts brought forth in the hearing.

Student-athletes have frequently been successful arguing under procedural due process simply because the NCAA has denied them any of the above elements of due process even though they have had substantial interest at stake. Nevertheless, the NCAA fails to see the issue in this light arguing that it does not pronounce sanctions affecting any particular student-athlete but only against member schools, and these institutions are provided with all due process requirements. Furthermore, the NCAA contends, if the courts feel the student-athlete is being individually sanctioned, all the requirements of due process are still met by the notice and fair hearing given to the member schools. Since the interest of the institution and the athlete are essentially the same, it is expected that the institution will take every move necessary to vindicate the athlete's interest. As to the first argument, it is doubtful at best if courts will let form obscure substance when constitutional rights are in the balance and the decisions seem to so hold. In regards to the later argument, it is questionable whether the presumption which underlies its position is valid since

> . . . [T]he interests of a university and its athletes will not always coincide.
>
> While a school normally challenges the NCAA initial ruling in hopes of obtaining a reversal, it also wishes to avoid antagonizing the NCAA and further jeopardizing its athletic program. To protect this interest the school may choose to comply with the ruling and on its own declare the offending athlete ineligible. Moreover, the members of the NCAA's Executive Committee have a possible conflict of interest because they represent competing institutions. As a result, there may be biased interest in imposing sanctions on another institution, an interest that might preclude a fair and impartial evaluation.[32]

In any case, it is improbable that courts will allow for due process protection to be afforded in proxy fashion.

While the due process defense is primarily concerned with the procedural aspect of NCAA rule enforcement, the equal protection claim goes directly to the substantive basis of NCAA rules. Briefly stated but dangerously oversimplified, equal protection requires that regulations enacted by the NCAA are reasonable in their application to individuals affected. Specifically, this Constitutional protection guarantees that classifications of regulations arising out of state action, will treat alike all those and only those persons who are similarly situated with regards to the purpose of the statute. Because of the different interests which might be curtailed through regulations, the Supreme Court has developed two distinct standards for reviewing equal protection cases--the low scrutiny or rational relationship test and the high scrutiny or compelling state interest test.

Under the low scrutiny approach, the challenged regulation will be reviewed to determine whether there is a reasonable relationship between the classification and a valid state objective. This standard always gives great deference to the legislative branch, allowing for a presumption of validity to the state regulation. All regulations are assumed to have a valid purpose and the burden is on the party contesting the validity to show otherwise. The state is also allowed, within the rule of reason, to deviate from a perfect regulation so that it can be overinclusive (persons within the classification are included in the regulation yet they fall outside the purpose of the statute) or underinclusive (the purpose of the statute is not wholly fulfilled since individuals not included in the classification fall within the statutory purpose).

Over the years the Supreme Court has developed a stricter test when the classification has burdened what the Court perceives to be certain key individual interests. If the trait by which the affected individual is classified is deemed "suspect" i.e., race, alienage or if the classification itself impairs a fundamental right, i.e., interstate travel, voting, speech, then the state must show a "compelling state interest" for the regulation to pass Constitutional screening. Under this high scrutiny approach the burden of proof is on the state and only after factual proof of the state's purpose will courts balance the individual interest involved with that of the state to see if the regulation is valid.

As to NCAA-student-athlete litigation, the now repealed 1.600 rule has been the focal point of the equal protection claim. Of the two cases that have decisions on the issue, both used the "low scrutiny" approach yet one upheld the rule while the other did not. In Parish v. NCAA, the court, stating that the NCAA rule need "only" be shown to have "some rational relationship to legitimate purposes" held the regulation reasonable. The purpose according to the NCAA was to

> establish a minimum standard which would prevent exploitation of athletes by the college or university, that is, setting up and agreeing to the prediction process by NCAA's members in order to prevent recruitment for athletic purposes along of young men who had relatively poor chances of obtaining academic degrees; to encourage institutions with lower standards to elevate [them] . . . ; to discourage unsound and economic practices of the past which had allowed indiscriminate granting of scholarships, resulting in too many athletes dropping out their freshman and sophomore years.[33]

In Associated Students v. NCAA[34] the court upheld the 1.600 rule per se but felt that the interpretation of it by Official Interpretations 418 (O.I. 418) was a denial of equal protection. The interpretation penalized any student who failed to meet the 1.600 rule and had practiced or participated in an intercollegiate athletic program his first year by declaring him ineligible for a second year. Due to this extension of the original sanction, the court concluded the regulation was unreasonable.

> Once a student has an earned grade point average achieved over a reasonable period of time, then it is unreasonable, in light of the purpose of the rule, to impose sanctions against the student based on the fact that he failed to predict a certain grade point average.[35]

Conclusion:

The present trend would seem to indicate further litigation in the immediate future; several factors point to this conclusion. Student-athletes, and to a lesser degree institutions, have been fairly successful at attaining their desired ends through the legal system. As far as student-athletes there is at present no guarantee of procedural due process nor are there plans by the NCAA to remedy the situation despite the warnings by the courts. In addition, although the 1.600 rule has been abolished, the equal protection issue could rise again concerning other classifications required of student-athletes but not of students at large. Institutions will tend to go to court for restraining orders when they are seeking to buy time to complete an athletic season without prohibitory sanctions. The success of USL at accomplishing this will influence others. Add to this a latent belief by many in college athletics, especially less established athletic powers, that the NCAA sanctioning and enforcement procedures are selective and biased, and looking to the courts for resolution of disputes will more and more appear to be the worthwhile approach to take.

There is little doubt of the detrimental consequences this volume of litigation between participants of the intercollegiate athletic system has on college athletics. Publicity, the side effects of most litigation, can be harful especially when penalized schools begin to rebut accusations. The present Long Beach State suit has brought charges against the NCAA by persons involved which include racism, selective enforcement of NCAA rules and corruption while the NCAA accuses Long Beach State of illegal payoffs and slush funds.[36]

Another repercussion is the distrust created among competing schools, arising out of beliefs that the sister institution is responsible for the genesis of the investigation. The USL litigation brings this point home as the major athletic powers in the State of Louisiana were accused by USL as the instigators of all the litigation, the reason being USL's fast rise to athletic prominence. Perhaps the greatest harm, however, is the effect on the student-athlete, the principal object of college athletics. Without ever expecting it, he is forced to the courtroom to retain a right which he took for granted all along. Not only is this expensive and time consuming to the student-athlete but more important, there is a strong tendency for him to become disillusioned with college athletics and all that it is supposed to stand for. Finally, all these cases have a way of undermining the NCAA's ability to rule effectively at the realm of college athletics. As schools and student-athletes are able to effectively seek redress in the courts, they will look less towards the NCAA as the final word in matters relating to intercollegiate sports.

In light of these consequences, especially the adverse publicity and meager judicial success, it seems appropriate to question why the NCAA has not provided hearings for student-athletes. While other reasons may be presented, it is quite probable the underlykng problem involves lack of adequate resources to handle this situation. If the NCAA is to provide hearings for all sanctioning procedures, it would necessitate a broad outlay of money and personnel to obtain suitable proof. Obviously, the cost would run high and with its present financial budget, the NCAA appears incapable of such an all encompassing arrangement. Nevertheless, courts are not amenable to arguments that economic cost is prohibitive when Constitutional rights lie in the balance. This aspect leads to the conclusion that if the NCAA is to perform a proper regulatory function in intercollegiate athletics it must be prepared to provide sufficient money and personnel or in the end, its' ability to govern effectively will be severely curtailed.

Not only should the NCAA be concerned about this type of litigation, but individual member schools, especially state schools, should heed its warnings. While all the litigation to date has involved the NCAA, there is no protective veil around individual institutions providing immunity if they fail to furnish Constitutional guarantees. These institutions should be prewarned of the emerging legal constraints applicable to their actions and shape their moves accordingly.

Finally, the overall impact of the cases discussed in this section and the consequences flowing from them seem to indicate a call for formalization in the disciplinary aspects of sports. This trend is not surprising since it has been seen in a number of social institutions which affect large groups of individuals. In addition the certainty brought about by the advent of formalization will erase some of the arbitrariness currently found in the NCAA's disciplinary procedures. While some disadvantages such as limited flexibility for individual cases are present, the advantages are substantial. Most definitely, a careful and thorough consideration of formal disciplinary procedures by athletic administrators seem warranted.

## INJURIES IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The problem of injuries in intercollegiate athletics has remained a constant throughout its history. Because of the need for strenuous physical activity in sports, injuries in a sense are inevitable. Not surprisingly, most intercollegiate athletic programs provide for most or all of the medical costs incurred from injuries while participating in intercollegiate sports.

Nevertheless, in cases where the student-athlete is not compensated or even if he is, the athlete still has a recourse in the courts to obtain financial losses which either he has not been compensated for or go beyond mere medical cost. There are two areas which the student-athlete might meet the requirements. The first is the usual civil remedy in tort based on the negligence of the institution or its employees. Under this legal theory, the athlete could recover not only his medical expenses but also for his pain and suffering and loss of future power to earn money which have resulted from the injury. However, as a result of the student-athlete's inability in most instances to meet the various burdens of proofs necessary for a plaintiff and coupled with the affirmative defenses open to the defendants such as assumption of risk or contributory negligence, these actions are seldom brought.[37]

The second recourse of the student-athlete is in the area of workmen's compensation. Unlike an action based on tort, there is no need to show fault of the defendant nor is the action barred by affirmative defenses. Because of several cases in this area dealing directly with scholarships athletes in intercollegiate athletics and the possible applicability of present NCAA financial aid rules to this area, an expanded discussion follows.

Briefly, workmen's compensation acts allow for compensation to employees who, in the course of their employment receive accidental injuries. Compensation comes regardless of fault, although the employee must not consciously inflict a self injury. The employer's common law defenses are taken away in exchange for the limited liability provided by statutory law enacted in all fifty states. The injury must occur while working for the employer and the liability is dependent on the status created by employment. While the employer-employee relationship must be proven and the employee must be under regular employment, all the requirements have usually been given a broad construction by the courts because of the remedial nature of the statutes.[38]

In University of Denver v. Nemeth,[39] a case of first impression, the Supreme Court of Colorado upheld the position that a scholarship athlete, under certain circumstances, meets a requirement as an employee and therefore is entitled to benefits under the workmen's compensation act. The facts revealed that Nemeth was employed by the University of Denver to keep the tennis courts free from gravel and litter, and was given meals for lower rates by the athletic department. Availability of the job and the meals was dependent on whether Nemeth's performance on the football field was satisfactory to the coaching staff. Nemeth injured his back while participating in a football practice and was unable to continue either the employment or athletic participation. In upholding the Industrial Commission Ruling that Nemeth was entitled to workmen's compensation, the court found sufficient evidence to sustain that Nemeth was an employee of the University and that his injury had come about as an incident of that employment. While admitting the case was one of first impression, the court reasoned that the controlling question was whether "under all the circumstances, the injury arose from something which was incident to the employment,"and added, that as to this issue, a number of prior decisions supported the Commission's findings.[40] The cases cited in the opinion dealt with a variety of employer-employee relationships. From this case, the court inferred the proposition that once the employer-employee relation was established, any activity by the employee which in any way was incident to the continuation of that employment was covered under workmen's compensation. "The obligation to compensate Nemeth," the court concluded, "arises solely because of the nature of the contract, its incidence and the responsibilities assumed in order to not only earn his remuneration, but to retain his job."[41]

A similar issue was presented to the California District Court of Appeals in Van Horn v. Industrial Accident Commission.[42] Here, the athlete was granted a one year football scholarship and "rent money" by the athletic department; this aid continuing throughout the year without regards to the participation or performance by the athlete. There was, however, a tacit understanding that such aid would be renewed on the basis of the athlete's participation in the football program. The athlete was killed on his return to California from participating in a regular scheduled event in Ohio.

While the Industrial Commission denied the decedent's family workmen's compensation death benefits on grounds that the student-athlete did not meet the necessary criteria to be an employee of the school, the Appeals Court reversed. The court found that the financial aid the athlete received was, in effect, remuneration for the decedent's participation in the football program, thereby forming an employment relationship between the decedent and the school.

In defense of its conclusion, the Commission made the following policy arguments. First, that holding for the athlete would impose too great a burden on institutions of higher learning, thus contravening public policy. The Van Horn court, however, correctly observed that the embodiment of public policy is workmen's compensation; the protection of the laborer carrying more social import than difficulties which might disturb the employer. Second, that if the scholarship athlete falls under the workmen's compensation act, any scholarship student would be eligible for such compensation, thereby discouraging the granting of scholarships making it incompatible with legislative intent. Here, the opinion draws a sharp line. While holding firm to the premise that "there is authority for the proposition that one who participates for compensation as a member of an athletic team may be an employee within the statutory scheme of the workmen's compensation act,"[43] the court nevertheless admitted that some athletes under financial aid may not be eligible for benefits under workmen's compensation. The controlling factor is whether the institution has established a "contract for employment" with the athlete and such a contract exists when the appropriate quid pro quo is present. In the instant case the court found the necessary consideration although the Commission's finding had shown the one year scholarship not to be contingent on the athlete's athletic participation. The court concluded that "but for" the athletic participation the student would have never received a scholarship. This the court held to be sufficient to establish the necessary "contract of employment" for workmen's compensation to apply. Finally, in connection with the previous contention, the Commission argued that allowing recovery to scholarship athletes under workmen's compensation would discourage the institution from awarding such grants. The court, in accordance with its previous argument, impliedly recognized this possibility, but suggests that schools which were concerned about such consequences, should avoid any contractual arrangement with the athlete by making the aid wholly gratuitous. That is, by neither attaching performance or participation in the program a condition for renewal of financial aid, the institution could negate the implication that there was a contractual relationship involved.

These cases have become of special relevance due to the recent changes of the financial aid rules in intercollegiate athletics. Most scholarships to student-athletes are being given on a year to year basis as opposed to the pre 1973 custom of granting a full four year grant-in-aid. Renewal of the scholarship is mostly left up to the head coaches or to some type of committee whose criteria will most likely include, and be determined by, athletic performance. Under these circumstances, the facts are parallel to the Van Horn case.

> The evidence was that to receive an athletic scholarship a student must have maintained a 2.2 grade average, must be a member of an athletic team and be recommended by the coach to the scholarship committee. He recommended only those who were on the team. There was evidence that the coach had no power to overrule the committee or to terminate a scholarship before the term for which it was granted had elapsed but that evidence does not support the inference that there was no relationship between the scholarship and [the student's] athletic prowess or participation. The only inference to be drawn from the evidence is that decedent received the scholarship because of his athletic prowess and participation.[44]

Nevertheless, to date, only two states have decided these type cases and there are no decisions under the present NCAA financial aid rules. Although two out of the three decisions so far have been favorable to the student, it is too early to project what the majority of courts will do. Almost surely educational institutions will argue no employee-employer relationship based on a variety of factors which courts might find persuasive.[45] Whatever the outcome, however, the present NCAA financial aid rules have certainly detracted from the institutions factual position, enabling students to more easily advance a contractual relationship under a Van Horn type analysis.

The cost of workmen's compensation insurance to colleges and universities will, in most instances, not prove burdensome. Nevertheless, many of these institutions might desire to avoid the aura of a contractual relationship between itself and the athlete because of the many possible repercussions from an employer-employee relationship.[46] To do so, the tailoring of athletic financial aid grants will have to more closely approximate that of true scholarships. This avenue presents a troublesome alternative to a number of athletic departments because of the financial pressures which are currently facing them. Perhaps the only viable course of action available to them will be to continue their performance related grants. In choosing this path, however, institutions should be prepared for the possibility of increasing emphasis by the courts on the business nature of the relationship.

The treatment of athletes in what is supposedly an amateur status as employees of the university is unfortunate, and not surprisingly, seems to point to the broader problem of the business orientation of intercollegiate sports. As it relates to the present topic, two aspects can be noted. First to the extent that the business orientation fluctuates, a corresponding change will probably be reflected in the way the athlete's position looks to the courts--a scholarship student as opposed to an employee. Thus this area might serve as a reflection to how far a business perspective has encapsulated collegiate sports. Secondly, if there is no move towards less professionalization, institutions should consider total compensation--medical costs, salary, disability pay--towards an injured student-athlete. Not only would this be ethically proper if a strong business atmosphere prevails, but the cases presented give at least some indication that courts might be ready to consider such comprehensive programs.

## SEX DISCRIMINATION

Although there had been no reported cases until the last three years, litigation based on sex discrimination in amateur athletics has begun to appear in large numbers. To date, there is no reported litigation at the intercollegiate level even though there exists a considerable volume of litigation at the high school stage, the ramifications of which are likely to be felt in college athletics. This latter conclusion is based on the following premises. First, there is a lack in both minor and major athletic programs of either athletically induced financing or even athletic participation available for females while there exists a large amount of both for male participants. Second is the increasing success that females have had in litigation at the high school level[47] and the favorable attitude the public has taken toward such actions. Finally, there is now federal legislation prohibiting any sex discrimination in federally assisted institutions. Title IX of The Higher Education Act of 1972 provides that

> No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any educational program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance . . . .[48]

The impact of this legislation has been recently heightened by regulations promulgated by the Office of Civil Rights and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare which would require "equal opportunity" for women within the realm of all collegiate activities--including such areas as athletic scholarships, facilities, scheduling and coaching. While the impact of this legislation on intercollegiate athletic programs is not clear,[49] there is a distinct possibility that litigation might arise from it.

Pressure on higher education to eliminate differential treatment based on sex is growing; not surprisingly institutions have begun to act before unwanted litigation or financial aid restrictions become a reality. Already the Big Eight Conference has deleted the word "male" from its eligibility requirements thus opening the door to female participation in sports ranging from gymnastics, track and golf to contact events such as football and wrestling.[50] In a more direct approach, fourteen athletic grants for females only, each based on the $2,500 tuition cost are being awarded by the University of Miami.[51] As stated by the head of the scholarships committee, the aim of the grants is to place women in equality with men as far as facilities and opportunities and not in equal footing as athletes. The University of North Carolina has also followed suit but their number of grants is considerably fewer.

If litigation based on sex discrimination does reach the collegiate level, administrators can expect the equal protection clause to be basis of the action just as it has been the backbone of the high school cases. [For a general discussion of this area of Constitutional law see discussion on equal protection starting on page 19.] Arguments on both sides are also likely to resemble the suits at the high school level. In regards to the student, once the state action requirement is passed, she must demonstrate a substantial interest at stake such as educational value of competitive athletics, enhancement of personal reputation by participation or the improved instruction of coaching staffs.[52] The "interest" must subsequently be shown to be barred to the student by reason of sex, a basis which would be asserted to be unreasonable.

In order to get the more favorable "high scrutiny" test of the equal protection clause the argument has been made that sex should be treated as a "suspect" classification but to date, the courts have refused to so hold. The reason probably lies in that the Supreme Court of the United States has not dealt with sex as a "suspect" classification. In the only recent case before the Court based on a sex category, the classification was found to be unconstitutional but under a low scrutiny approach.[53] Following suit, the lower courts have dealt with the sex category in high school athletics under the low scrutiny standard yet, like the Supreme Court, have demanded more justification from the state than under the usual low scrutiny test. In effect, this new method of dealing with equal protection cases falls somewhere in the middle of the other two approaches, and the exact parameters of the test are difficult to define.[54]

To meet this new standard or at least the low scrutiny approach, school administrators have promulgated several reasons for a classification based on sex. Foremost is the obvious cost increase required to develop and maintain new programs and facilities. Physiological differences in terms of ability to participate competitively with males has also been advanced. In connection with the latter argument, school officials have indicated the strong possibility that women's athletic programs would be eliminated since opening male teams to both sexes would require a reciprocal move by female teams. Given the overall superiority of male participants, they would soon predominate over female membership in all teams.

These arguments have not attained a favorable reception in the courts. As to cost increase, courts have observed that if this is the case, at the very least the state is obligated to split up the present cost between the male and female participants. Concerning the female ability to compete, this is based on speculative consideration of females as a class which does not take into account individual ability within that class to participate successfully. In fact, this is the evil which the Supreme Court was trying to suppress in Reed v. Reed,[55] the only case to go before the Court challenging a law based on a sex classification. As stated in Brenden v. Independent School District,

> In our view, Reed precludes a state from using assumptions about the nature of females as a class, to deny to females an individualized determination of their qualifications for a benefited provided by the state.[56]

After refuting the school administrator's position, most courts have held the classification unconstitutional under the equal protection clause. The majority have required the opportunities for males in all athletic participation to be opened up for female membership.[57] At least one court has expressly held that a separate but equal arrangement would meet the equal protection requirement.[58]

Whether the sex discrimination issue will affect intercollegiate athletics, through personal litigation, as profoundly as it has high school sports is still questionable. As noted, no reported litigation has transpired at this level. In addition, there are arguments that athletics at the collegiate level have a purpose different from its high school counterpart and that, therefore, the sex dichotomy serves a substantial state purpose. For example, college athletics is more of a business which must cater to the wants of the public in order to obtain financing and the public demands male participation because of high male permeation in professional sports. Whether this and other arguments can satisfy the Constitutional mandate of the equal protection clause remains to be seen.

If intercollegiate athletic programs fail to satisfy the equal protection test on the sex discrimination grounds, the resultant effect on athletic programs will turn on the remedies fashioned by the courts. If an equal access approach is decreed, institutions will experience less disruption in their present programs. All teams and facilities will need to be opened to female participation but their capacity to remain in the program will be dependent on their ability. It is unlikely that major capital outlays will be required by this approach, neither will there be a great influx of female participants in most sports. Their inherently inferior physical skills in male oriented athletic events will prevent this outcome. A completely different result will transpire, however, if the courts conclude that an equal opportunity, or its corollary, separate but equal approach, is necessary. Under this remedy, institutions would need to establish such things as equal facilities, athletic scholarships and coaching for women which would not only split present athletic budgets down the middle but require capital outlays solely for females in order to build facilities which are presently only available to males. This is the solution which the new HEW guidelines indicate and which prompted the following sharply worded reply by the NCAA.

> If athletics are to be covered [under Title IX of The Higher Education Act] they should be covered in a reasonable, practical manner, not through regulations which ostensibly seek to severely damage by design the revenue-producing sports program and increase greatly the present $49.5 million annual deficit of NCAA members in conducting intercollegiate athletic programs.[59]

In effect, if the HEW guidelines are enforced by the courts or if the courts feel such an approach is necessary once the issue is presented in a private action, the structure of intercollegiate athletics will be revamped, in probably the most sweeping change since its inception.

## CONCLUSION

Litigation in the areas covered in this paper is by no means quieting down, rather the indication is that there will be expanded activity. Although the present court actions do not as of present constitute a major threat to the structure of intercollegiate athletics, it is a source of concern which could lead to radical structural changes if the system does not heed its warnings and adjust to the times. The ability of intercollegiate athletics to do so will depend on farsighted college administrators who understand what the present realities of college athletics are as opposed to recognizing only what they were twenty years ago.

[1] While it can be argued that no First Amendment rights have in fact been violated, this position is undermined by recent writers. Scott, The Athletic Revolution (1971); Shaw Meat on the Hoof, 1972; The Miami Herald July 4, 1971 at 6-D; Meggysey, Out of Their League 1970. Furthermore, just the long time span covered coupled with the authoritarian nature of most sports would seem to indicate, at the very least, some violations.

At the threshold it might be suggested a lack of awareness by the student-athletes as to their Constitutionally protected rights. Yet even with the advent of a more aware athlete, there is still few actions brought in this area. Perhaps this can be tempered with the fact that athletic programs themselves have altered their view as to the manner of treatment of student-athletes.

> "I suppose that the era of the tightfisted disciplinarian might be over. There seems to be more communication than in the past and I think that is good. For the most part, we are dealing with mature young men and they have good ideas. We would be foolish if we didn't listen to them." Paul "Bear" Bryant, University of Alabama football coach, in Durham Morning Herald, Sept. 2, 1973 at 3C.

Even if the student-athlete was aware, he might have decided against any action since his plea was unlikely to be heard by receptive ears. Both in the legal and lay communities the atmosphere was less than favorable for any such action. Again this premise is undermined by the small amount of litigation today when both the legal and lay communities are receptive to such actions.

[2] 468 F.2d 1079 (1972).

[3] 393 U.S. 503 (1969).

[4] Id.

[5] First Amendment prohibits compulsory flag salute in public schools. West Virginia State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette, 319 U.S. 624 (1943).

[6] 393 U.S. 503, 508 (1969).

[7] Id. at 512, 513.

[8] 468 F.2d 1079, 1084 (1972).

[9] "Without deciding whether approval of the armband display would have involved state action . . . we are persuaded that the Trustees' decision was lawful within the limitation of the Tinker case itself." 468 F.2d 1079, 1084 (1972).

[10] "We do not base our holding on the presence of any violence or disruption. There was no showing or finding to that effect . . . " 468 F.2d 1079, 1084 (1972).

[11] See 19 Kansas La. Rev. 316. "Even if permitted to carry out their intentions, it is doubtful that the 14 plaintiffs would have fostered an establishment of religion. There is a measurable difference between symbolic speech criticizing religious beliefs and a law or regulatory scheme that lends official approval to one religious doctrine, law or organizational structure." at 320. It can also be argued that the rule prohibiting any demonstration by athletes was overly broad, had a chilling effect on speech and was therefore per se unconstitutional.

[12] Durham Morning Herald, Feb. 9, 1974 § B at 3.

[13] At a later date all threats of suspension were dropped after the athletes decided to conform with the regulation.

[14] Isaac Curtis and Larry Brumsey v. MCAA No. C712088 ACW (N.D. Calif. Feb. 2, 1972).

[15] The 1.600 Rule required a college freshman's prior scholastic performance to predict an ability to attain a 1.6 average during his collegiate studies. This prediction was based on cumulative grade point averages achieved at the high school level and an entrance examination approved by the NCAA.

[16] Robert Parrish, Welton Bookshire, Rich Jacobs, Dale Kinkelaar, and Jerry Waugh v. NCAA, U.S. District Court Western Dist. of Louisiana, 1973 Civ. No. 18733.

[17] Parish v. NCAA, 361 F.Supp. 1220 (1973).

[18] Roland Grant and John Williamson v. NCAA filed in the Court of Common Pleas, Philadelphia County, Penn. 1973.

[19] Durham Morning Herald, Jan. 15, 1974 § B, at 3.

[20] Durham Morning Herald, Jan. 16, 1974 § B at 5.

[21] 346 F. Supp. 602 (1972).

[22] The guidelines were as follows: "Plaintiffs should be given a written notice of the time and place of the hearing at least two days in advance. Accompanying such notice should be a specification of the charges against each and the grounds which, if proven, would justify imposition of a penalty. The hearing should be such that the Directors of Athletics have an opportunity to hear both sides of the story. This does not require a full-dress judicial hearing, with the right to cross-examine witnesses. However, it should include the presentation of direct testimony in the form of statements by each of those directly involved relating their version of the interest. Plaintiffs should be given a list of all witnesses who will appear, and should be allowed to hear all testimony. Plaintiffs should be given a written report specifying the Directors' findings of fact, and if there is to be any punishment the basis for such punishment. The proceedings should be recorded and the tapes should be made available to plaintiffs in the event they wish to appeal . . . ."

[23] Golden Bear Athletic Foundation v. NCAA, No. C-711930 ACW (N.D. Cal. Oct. 6, 1971).

[24] Bd. of Education for the State of Louisiana, Individually and in Behalf of the University of Southwestern Louisiana v. NCAA, filed in the 15th Judicial District Court of the State of Louisiana.

[25] See Behegen v. Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Rep. 346 F.Supp 602 at 604, 1972 for an example of judicial treatment of the area.

[26] See Parish v. NCAA 361 F.Supp. 1220 (1973).

[27] United States v. Guest, 383 U.S. 745, 755-56 (1966).

[28] Evans v. Newton 382 U.S. 296, 299.

[29] 361 F.Supp. 1214, 1219 (1973).

[30] Curtis v. NCAA No. C 712088 ACN (N.D. Calif. Feb. 2, 1972).

[31] As is applicable to the present cases see Behegen v. Intercollegiate Conference of Faculty Rep. 346 F.Supp. 602 (1972).

[32] 24 Stand. L. Rev. 903, 908.

[33] 361 F.Supp. 1220, 1226 (1973).

[34] Associated Students v. NCAA Civil No. S-2754 (E.D. Cal. May 25, 1973).

[35] Id.

[36] See Los Angeles Times Jan. 18, 1974; Part III.

[37] See Cramer v. Hoffman 390 F.2d 19 (1968); For one case in this area, but at the high school level, which the defendant coach was found liable for negligence resulting in the death of a 16 years old football player who had suffered a heat stroke see Mogabgab v. Orleans Parish School Board 239 So.2d 456.

[38] See 99 C.J.S. §§ 1-5.

[39] 127 Colo. 385, 257 P.2d 423 (1953).

[40] Id. at 426.

[41] Id. at 430.

[42] 33 Cal. Rptr. 169 (1963).

[43] Id. at 173.

[44] ss Cal. Rptr. 169, 174.

[45] For example, institutions will undoubtedly stress the academic function of scholarships and that their treatment of athletes in no way resembles that of an employee-employer relationship, i.e., there is no withholding of wages for social security or taxes, there is no mandatory minimum wage.

[46] Need to withhold taxes and social security. Possible need to create pension plans under right circumstances. Ability to form unions by student-athletes.

[47] Morris v. Michigan State Bd. of Educ., 472 F.2d 1207 (6 Cir. 1973); Haas v. South Bend Community School Corp., 289 N.E. 2d 495 (Ind. 1972); Brenden v. Independent School Dist., 342 F.Supp. 1224 (D. Minn. 1972, aff'd 477 F.2d 1292 (8 Cir. 1973); Hollander v. Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference, Civil No. 124427 (Conn. Super. Ct., New Haven County, March 29, 1971).

Cf. Gregorio v. Bd. of Education No. C-198869 (N.J. Super. Ct., Monmouth County, March 16, 1971); Hollander v. Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference No. 124427 (Conn. Super. Ct. New Haven County, March 29, 1971).

[48] 20 U.S.C. § 1681 This provision is made to resemble Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which forbids discrimination on the basis of race, color and national origin in all federally assisted programs.

[49] It is not clear in the sense of whether in a cause of action there must be proof of a direct connection between federal funds and athletic programs or whether a peripheral nexus will be held sufficient. HEW has stated, and the prevailing view is that collegiate athletic programs, by virtue of the fact that they are at least indirectly affiliated with other campus activities which receive federal funds, are subject to the statute and thus the regulations.

[50] Big Eight Conference Decision, March 2, 1973 meeting. Minute No. 2295 (2) at 1356.

[51] Los Angeles Times Jan. 24, 1974 Part III, pg. 3.

[52] See Reed v. Nebraska School Activities Ass'n, 341 F. Supp. 258 (D. Neb. 1972).

[53] Reed v. Reed 404 U.S. 71 (1971).

[54] For an explanation of this new standard see Gunther, The Supreme Court, 1971 Term, Foreword: In Search of Evolving Doctrine on a Changing Court: A Model for a Newer Equal Protection, 86 Harv. L. Rev. 1 (1972).

[55] 404 U.S. 71 (1971).

[56] 477 F.2d 1292, 1302 (1972).

[57] Haas v. South Bend Community School Corp., 289 N.E. 2d 495 (Ind. 1972); Brenden v. Independent School District 342 F. Supp. 1224 (D. Minn. 1972), aff'd, 477 F.2d 1292 (8 Cir. 1973); Reed v. Nebraska School Activities Ass'n, 341 F. Supp. 258 (D. Neb. 1972); Morris v. Michigan State Bd. of Educ., 472 F.2d 1207 (6 Cir. 1973). Contra: Bucha v. Illinois High School Association 351 F. Supp. 69 (N.D. Ill. 1972); Harris v. Illinois High School Association Civil No. 72-25 (S.D. Ill., Apr. 17, 1972).

[58] See Haas v. South Bend Community School Corp., 289 N.E. 2d 495 (Ind. 1972).

[59] As cited by The Chronicle (Duke University Publication) Vol. 69, Number 105. March 1, 1974.

APPENDIX B

# FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

MARCH 1974

ROBERT H. ATWELL

## FINANCIAL PROBLEMS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The financial dimension of intercollegiate athletics is perhaps the least understood facet of an activity that is constantly presented to the public through the press, television, and radio. On other hand, within particularly the NCAA Division I institutions, the financial dimension probably gets more attention from university administrators than any other aspect of the program. This reflects the fact that intercollegiate athletics is big business within the major institutions. In his 1970 study, Financial Analysis of Intercollegiate Athletics, Mitchell H. Raiborn concluded that the median NCAA Class A institution (corresponding roughly to the present Division I classification) spent $1.3 million on its intercollegiate athletics program in 1969. With some rough extrapolations for the succeeding 4 years, it is probable that the median is now about $1.9 million. A number of the institutions we examined had programs in the $2.5 to $3 million and above range.

The National Commission on the Financing of Postsecondary Education has estimated that higher education is, in rough terms, a $30 billion per year industry. Walter Byers, Executive Director of NCAA testified before a U.S. Senate Subcommittee two years ago that it was reasonable to assume that four-year institutions spent about $270 million annually on intercollegiate athletics. In very rough terms, then, intercollegiate athletics amounts to about 1% of the budget for higher education in the United States. (The $270 million figure is for four-year institutions and the $30 billion figure is for all institutions and thus the 1% figure allows for the expenditures of 2-year institutions).

Intercollegiate athletics is viewed as a theoretically self-supporting auxiliary enterprise in those relatively few (about 100) institutions with major competitive programs. The American Council on Education has defined an auxiliary enterprise as follows:

> "An entity that exists to furnish a service to students, faculty or staff, and that charges at a rate directly related, but not necessarily equal, to the cost of service. The general public may be served incidentally by some auxiliary enterprises."

The definition is ironic as applied to bigtime intercollegiate athletics because the "service" of the general public is by no means incidental to a major athletic program. Indeed, it is the sale of tickets to the general public that keeps such programs alive and hence, as we shall see, the program is in fact addressed less to the faculty, students, and staff and more to the outside public. Auxiliary enterprises, it may be noted, comprise about $3.5 billion of the $30 billion expenditures for higher education. In dollar terms, intercollegiate athletics is probably the 3rd most important auxiliary enterprise, after the dormitories and food service.

It is important to realize that intercollegiate athletics is classified as an auxiliary enterprise only in the major institutions where gate receipts are a significant income factor. In the NCAA Division 2 and 3 institutions, which comprise most institutions with intercollegiate athletics programs, such programs are not viewed as auxiliary enterprises. Rather athletics is a part of the regular budget of the institution in much the same manner as instruction. Ironically, then, it is the institutions in Division 2 and 3 of the NCAA, which do not have large programs supported by gate receipts, that have achieved the greatest institutional acceptance of the importance of athletics as manifested in institutional budgetary support. On the other hand, the institutions within Division 1, which have the largest gate receipts, the most publicity, and the most competitive schedules, have at the same time received relatively less institutional budgetary support. This reflects the historic presumption in these institutions that athletics will be a self-supporting auxiliary enterprise rather than an integral part of the institution's budgetary expenditures for its students.

The Raiborn study indicates that revenues for intercollegiate athletics programs varies markedly by type of institution. For the Class A institutions (118 institutions with strong football schedules) and Class E institutions (170 institutions which do not compete in football and are not major competitors in basketball), the following table indicates revenue sources by major type in 1969:

| | Class A | Class E |
|---|---|---|
| Ticket Sales | 51% | 40% |
| Student Activity Fee or Student Ticket Sales | 7% | 36% |
| Other Student Assessments Unrelated to Admissions | 5% | 8% |
| Ticket Sales from Away Games | 11% | 4% |
| Alumni Contributions | 5% | 10% |
| Radio-Television, and Post Season Game Income Distributed Through Conferences | 5% | -- |
| Direct State or Other Governmental Support | 2% | 2% |
| Other | 14% | -- |
| | 100% | 100% |
| Median Total Revenue | $1,273,000 | $10,000 |

As a very general statement, the most successful big-time comprehensive programs in the nation, from the point of view of spectator income, generate not more than about $2 million from gate receipts, which is 2/3 or less of their total income. Television and radio (generally shared among institutions in a given conference) could amount to another roughly $200,000 and shared income from conference participation in a post season football game might amount to about $100,000. Private gifts for the athletic program (mostly for financial aid) might amount to another $200,000 though this varies considerably as between institutions. This amounts to about $2.5 million. Other income includes concessions, student activity fees, legislative fee remissions and the rental of facilities. A major athletic program in a large institution will be in the $2 million to $3 million range and the sources of income will be roughly proportionate to those indicated.

The smaller institutions with small programs generate most of their income from the institutional budget or from student activity fees. There is thus a vast range of revenues from about $20,000 per year (the above $10,000 figure is badly outdated) to $3.5 million. The variables accounting for the differences include size of program, size of institution, extent to which coaches are supported from general institutional as opposed to athletic funds, and whether athletes are granted financial aid from athletic funds.

At the time of the Raiborn study, expenditures were for the following major purposes:

| | Class A | Class E |
|---|---|---|
| Financial Aid for Athletes | 31% | 24% |
| Distribution of Income to Visiting Teams | 14% | 1% |
| Salaries and Wages | 29% | 36% |
| Travel | 14% | 19% |
| Equipment and Uniforms | 4% | 9% |
| Other | 8% | 11% |
| | 100% | 100% |
| Median Total Expenditures | $1,299,000 | $43,000 |

As in the case of income, the differences between types of institutions are very large. While Class A institutions were generating approximately as much revenue as they were spending, the Class E institutions were spending $43,000 and taking in only $10,000. The balance reflects general institutional support.

We have pursued the study far enough to feel comfortable with the notion that the problem of financing intercollegiate athletics is for the bulk of the institutions which comprise the NCAA membership -- and those not members of the NCAA but with some intercollegiate athletics programs -- simply one of the many factors to be considered in institutional budgeting. In these institutions, the athletics program is an accepted part of the institution's general program and budget and, from our limited interviewing, we suspect that it is no more nor less of a budget problem than food service, dormitories, or physical plant maintenance. Its priority varies from one institution to another. The major point, however, is that there is very little logic to including such institutions in a study of intercollegiate athletics financing when there is so little in common between an institution with a $50,000 program and a $3 million program. Their common interest in athletics and thus the membership in NCAA of all types of institutions is a function of the desirability of common rules of eligibility and recruitment and of rules for particular sports. Beyond these matters, the University of Michigan athletic program has very little in common with that of Pomona-Pitzer. The financial crunch in intercollegiate athletics can reasonably be interpreted as meaning the NCAA Division 1 institutions with complete schedules in the major sports and with large grant-in-aid programs.

Within these major institutions, the usual arrangement is for a multi-sport program (say 8-15 intercollegiate sports) with football income supporting the entire program except for the other sources of income previously noted. In some institutions basketball is also a budgetary winner and in New England and some Midwestern schools, hockey is an increasingly popular spectator sport, which often generates a profit. In the Raiborn study, football accounted for a median of about 70% of the total athletics revenue of Class A institutions during most of a ten-year period ending in 1969. During that same period, football accounted for only about 50% of the expenditures and thus the 20% differential (about $250,000) was available for the rest of the athletic program. Basketball is generally a break-even operation except at very successful institutions such as UCLA with access to large arenas which they can fill with spectators most of the time. Among the institutions we contacted, only Marquette carries its entire athletic program (but with no football team) through basketball. Marquette is usually in the top 10 teams and it rents the Milwaukee arena for $2,000 to $3,000 per home game. Hockey is a budgetary winner at places such as Wisconsin, the 1973 NCAA championship team, where it contributes about $100,000 profit to the rest of the program.

Turning from the examination of income and expenses by sport to an overview of expenditures as a whole, the two largest items are salaries and wages and financial aid. The Raiborn figure of about 30% for salaries and wages in Class A institutions was confirmed in our examination of the budgets of a few of the institutions we reviewed where salaries and wages in 1973-74 are expected to range from 1/3 to about 40% of the total expenditures. These expenditures are associated with coaches, assistant coaches, maintenance personnel, clerical employees, and administrators. In 1969, the median Class A institution had a staff of 41 of which about half were coaches. There has been a marked trend to increase the coaching staff, particularly in football, because of increasing specialization. As the athletic program has grown in dollar terms, there has also been a tendency to increase the size of the non-coaching staff. Only about half of the growth in staff size in the 1960's (from 32.6% to 41.1%) according to the Raiborn study, was in coaching and the remainder is in administrative, clerical, and maintenance staffs.

Financial aid as a proportion of total budgets will vary considerably as between public and private institutions. At Minnesota, Michigan, and Wisconsin, it amounts to less than 20%. At the more expensive private institutions such as Stanford, the percentage can be somewhat, though not significantly, higher. While tuition is many times higher at private institutions than for in-state students at a state university, the grant-in-aid costs for private institutions are not always significantly higher for two reasons. First, financial aid for athletes as for other students is based on the total cost of attendance, including tuition, room and board, and miscellaneous costs of about $500 to $600 per student. Only tuition varies much as between public and private institutions and even at an expensive private institution, tuition is seldom more than 60% of the total cost of attendance. Secondly, the extent to which financial aid costs are higher at private than at public institutions will be mainly a function of the extent to which the public institution uses mainly student athletes from its own states or non-residents. Non-resident tuition at many public institutions approaches that in private institutions and thus most of the public-private differential disappears. The University of Michigan is an example of a large institution with a high proportion of out-of-state athletes. Thus Michigan's financial aid program is 90% as costly as Northwestern's but Northwestern's is $200,000 or 39% higher than the Big 10 average.

Travel and recruitment are two other major items of costs. Both the Raiborn study and our own inquiry indicate that travel accounts for 6 to 14% of the total budget with the variance being largely a function of schedules and the numbers of sports. Recruiting is often cited as a major item of cost, but our inquiry suggests that direct recruiting costs seldom amount to more than $100,000 and are generally much less. This is about 4% of a $2.5 million budget. That recruiting is a major problem in intercollegiate athletics we would not argue, but it should not be thought of as a major cause of financial difficulty.

The cost of maintaining and operating physical facilities varies greatly from one institution to another. In some institutions, the athletic program has paid for all of its facilities and maintains, heats, and lights them. In other cases, the institution has built the facilities and either rents them to the athletic program or has turned them over to the athletic program for operation and maintenance. In a number of cases, the institution pays for certain maintenance and utility costs in recognition of the fact that certain athletic facilities are used for recreation as well as intercollegiate athletics purposes. There is some evidence to suggest that there may be a strong correlation between budgetarily successful athletic programs and programs which have to operate and maintain few or none of their own facilities. The University of Southern California and Marquette come to mind as examples of institutions which are operating in the black at least partially because they do not operate football or basketball facilities.

A cost to a number of major athletic programs is the requirement that the athletic program contribute to the recreation program of the University. This can be a costly element in the budget of a number of institutions and relief from this obligation was one of the solutions proposed by athletic directors when their programs began to encounter budgetary problems.

**Recent trends**

During the decade of the 1960's, the budgets of institutions of higher education were increasing at an annual average rate of about 12%. During this same period athletics budgets were increasing at about 9% in the class A institutions of the Raiborn study. There is some evidence to suggest that both athletics and general institutional expenses have grown at slower rates since 1969. The United States Office of Education, Higher Educational General Information Survey, Financial Statistics of Institutions of Higher Education can reasonably be interpreted as reflecting a growth rate in the budgets of intercollegiate athletics between 1968-69 and 1971-72 of about 8% annually. Preliminary evidence suggests that this is roughly consistent with general budget growth during this period though the relevant HEGIS figures have not yet been officially released.

Raiborn has presented an interesting analysis of the factors causing increased expenditures for the ten years prior to 1969 as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| more athletes and general program expansion - | 25% |
| better coaching and more goods and services per athlete | 32% |
| inflation | 34% |
| other | 9% |
| | 100% |

Thus 2/3 of the increase would appear to be within the discretion of the institutions.

**What is the problem?**

The present state of intercollegiate athletics financing is is quite analagous to that of a liberal arts college. Its costs for the present program level are largely outside of its control, i.e. financial aid costs are determined principally by the level of fees set by the institution, salaries and wages will inexorably rise at rates determined by the institution for its total staff, travel costs are uncontrollable and rising rapidly. At the same time, the costs of the program which are in theory discretionary (Raiborn's 2/3 of the total) are, upon examination, in the nature of keeping up with the competition. If one intends to play big time football, one would be foolish to have many less than the present 105 maximum players allowable under NCAA rules. The same is true for the other revenue-producing sports (principally basketball and hockey) because a deterioration in the athletic success which might attend a cutback in financial aid in these sports would appear at the ticket window and the entire program could rapidly be put in jeopardy. The size of coaching staffs, at least in the major sports, is likewise a function of the standards of the league within which the institution competes. Travel and training table costs can be cut in virtually any major institution but again the standards are largely determined with an eye to the competition.

Adding to the combination of significantly uncontrollable costs and costs which are controllable but subject to the standards of the company one has chosen to keep is the fact that the public demand for the product is probably price-elastic. Intercollegiate athletics competes for the marginal entertainment dollar. At $7 (or $8 next Fall in some institutions), the cost of a football ticket far exceeds that of the movies amd of many plays and most musical events. Within athletics, it compares with professional football which is formidible competition in some major cities. With the energy crisis looming, the elasticity of demand for tickets not only becomes a function of price but of the availability of fuel as well.

Attendance seems to go hand in hand with success. The Wisconsin experience (Wisconsin is third in the nation in football attendance with a relatively unsuccessful team) is a notable exception to the general rule. Many conferences (e.g. Atlantic coast Conference) have stadia which would not permit significantly greater attendance. Institutions in the Big 10, Big 8, or Pacific 8, have facilities which allow for greater attendance but the fact that virtually every conference is dominated by one or at the most two teams is a factor in holding down attendance at events in which the major contenders are not participating. Almost no one interviewed believed that increased football attendance would be a major factor in the years ahead. Basketball and hockey are possibilities for schools with successful programs, but this is again very dependent on the size of the facilities available. Basketball and hockey are sports in which the interests of the students and the economic requirements of big time athletics clash. In many if not most institutions with successful basketball programs, the institution has had to limit free or low-income attendance by students in order to generate income from full paying customers. The contradictions of intercollegiate athletics are nowhere more apparent than in the case of depriving the students of the opportunity to view their fellow students participating in an amateur athletic event for the sake of generating income!

Thus, we have three major factors at work causing a crunch in intercollegiate athletics financing. First, we have costs which are increasingly uncontrollable and very responsive to the current inflationary trends of the economy. Secondly, we have costs which, while theoretically discretionary, are in reality determined by the marketplace in which your institution chooses to compete. Finally, about 2/3 of the income necessary to support the enterprise comes in the form of gate receipts volatility of which is influenced by factors such as success on the field or court, competition from other forms of entertainment including but not limited to professional sports, and the extent to which facilities are already used to capacity.

## Alternative solutions

### 1. Put financial aid on a needs basis.

Athletes in major institutions are generally granted full financial aid (tuition, room and board, miscellaneous fees, and books and personal expenses) simply by virtue of their athletic prowess. The Ivy League is the major exception to this. (Ivy League schools provide no financial aid to athletes *per se*. They actively recruit athletes who are granted financial aid by the University, not the Athletic Department, on the same basis as other students.) In most institutions, financial aid is awarded to non-athletes on the basis of a financial needs analysis system which starts with a Parents Confidential Statement listing income and assets. The system is complex but systematic and generally regarded as fair. Athletes are the major exception to the statement that financial aid is awarded to students principally on the basis of need.

Critics of the need system or defenders of the athletic grant-in-aid system have several arguments. First, the Big 10, which was the last of the major conferences to adopt an athletic grant-in-aid program, abolished the old needs system because of the abuses which it encouraged. To attract a young man who might not qualify on a needs basis for full aid, the athletic department and/or its outside supporters would arrange for "under the table" arrangements with the athlete. When all athletes in all institutions are treated the same, as is now the case, the temptation to do this is largely, though not entirely, negated. Secondly, supporters of the present system point out that student athletes have to devote many hours to their sport; the commitment in time is probably greater than for any other extra-curricular student activity. Finally, the critics of the needs system for athletes are generally and philosophically opposed to it. The system does discourage thrift and certainly penalizes the family that has worked hard to set aside money for the education of its children while rewarding the less prudent family.

The fact remains that a needs program for athletes, whatever its philosophic and operational problems, would save the major athletic programs of the nation several hundred thousand dollars per year. It was considered more than a year ago by the NCAA with very little support. It is safe to say that a move in this direction will not be forthcoming from within the NCAA or the ranks of Athletic Directors.

2. Eliminate financial aid in non-revenue producing sports.

In the Big 10 alone, this would save an average of about $150,000 per institution, excluding hockey which produces revenue in some institutions. There is no athletic justification for singling out the revenue-producing sports in this manner. The justification rests quite baldly on the assertion that it is the revenue-producing sports that are carrying the program and in these sports it is essential that the institution be competitive, which it can only be through grants-in-aid.

This is a politically more acceptable alternative than the first, but it rather clearly requires concerted action within one or more conferences. The major obstacle is that some institutions specialize in a particular non-revenue producing sport (Indiana in swimming, for example) and would presumable resist the elimination of grants-in-aid for such sports. The "wild card" wywtem to permit tenders for one sport outside of the revenue producers has been suggested as a solution to this problem.

3. Remove the non-revenue producing sports from the intercollegiate athletics budget.

This is often suggested by those who note that football and basketball are the only sports which support themselves and these sports should not be asked to carry the entire program. The advocates of this solution often contend that the non-revenue producing sports should be continued but with general institutional financial support. The counter-argument is that the purpose of the athletic program is not to make money but to afford athletes an opportunity to compete and their fellow students the chance to be spectators. The critics argue that this solution is an open admission that intercollegiate athletics is a business and the more wholesome (i.e. less professional) sports are being cast out in favor of big time football.

4. Support of intercollegiate athletics by professional athletics.

A number of institutions, notably Michigan and Northwestern, have derived revenue from the use of their stadia or field houses for professional football or basketball games. A number of universities have stadia or field houses which have more seating capacity than generally available to pro teams and hence the attraction to the pros is obvious. There has, however, been considerable resistance to this by some universities because it supposedly taints the amateur university programs with professionalism. In recognition of this concern, the Big 10, for example, has adopted a policy which permits pro football games only before or after the university season. The use of facilities for professional events is, of course, an option available only to a limited number of institutions and could probably not be regarded as a generalized solution to the financial problems of intercollegiate athletics.

It is often contended that big time intercollegiate football and basketball are really in the nature of "farm" operations or the minor leagues leading to the major professional leagues. The logic of the argument is that if the pros want it that way they should pay for a part of the cost rather than asking the universities to subsidize what is really a business unrelated to education. The counter-argument, of course, is that football and basketball now pay their own way and it is essential to separate amateur and professional athletics. Indeed, much of the effort of the NCAA is devoted to the maintenance of at least theoretical amateurism and thus it is politically and perhaps morally unfeasible to look to professional athletics for direct subsidies of intercollegiate programs.

5. Save money in recruiting.

It is often suggested that cutting down on aggressive recruiting is a way to save money and to discourage many of the presumably corrupt practices associated with intercollegiate athletics. As previously noted, recruiting is not one of the major costs of large athletic programs and saving half of such costs would only be a savings of 2% to 3% of total expenditures. Cut throat recruiting is a serious problem in intercollegiate athletics, but it is not primarily a budgetary problem. There is one step that could be taken which would save considerably in the way of cost and even more in terms of the tension and hostility which recruiting produces; that would be the establishment of a national letter of intent. Presently, there are only deadlines within conferences by which an athlete has to notify an institution of his intention to enroll. Since the dates vary between conferences, institutions are often forced to recruit twice, once prior to conference deadlines and a second time in competition with another conference with a later date. The establishment of a national (NCAA) deadline would be helpful and would save some expenditures.

6. Save money in travel and training tables.

The standards of travel (nature of accomodations, air versus bus travel, etc.) and the existence of training tables are items on which there can be savings. Training tables are desirable, but certainly not necessary items of expenditure. Yet if one institution in a conference has this amenity, others feel forced to offer it to compete. The same is true with the level or standard of accomodations for athletes in travel. A number of institutions now are trying to schedule multiple sport events at a given time with another institution in order to avoid repeated travel to the same city. The use of buses rather than air travel is also more frequent.

7. Minimize the extent to which the athletic program is responsible for the operation of facilities.

Mention has previously been made of the budgetary success of certain major institutions which do not have their own facilities. It seems clear that the operation and maintenance of facilities is a major drain on a number of institutions. Many of the stadia were built in the 1920's, and some have received very little attention since then. Frequently adjoining field houses were built about the same time. The facilities have in some cases been allowed to deteriorate and are in need of deferred maintenance.

In the financial crunch of recent years, allowing the physical plant to deteriorate has been budgetarily attractive though penny-wise and pound foolish. While a football stadium is seldom useful for something else, field houses are often multiple-use facilities, and athletic departments are making increasing efforts either to collect rent for such uses by other departments of the university or by outside organizations or to ask the university to pay for all or a share of the maintenance and utilities cost in light of the multiple use of facilities.

8. Do not require intercollegiate athletics to support intramural recreation programs.

Ohio State, Michigan, and Stanford are examples of institutions where the athletics program has not only supported itself but has provided a subsidy to recreation programs, not only by making facilities available, but also by direct subsidies of operating costs. Such subsidies are often justified by the institution by reference to a mandatory student activity fee, some of the proceeds of which go to the athletic program. Most athletic programs are no longer in a position where they can even support a multiple sport intercollegiate program, and the burden of carrying a recreation program is becoming intolerable. Thus, efforts are now being made to have the university pick up these costs.

9. Eliminate two platoon football.

Separate offensive and defensive teams and the attendant double couching staffs are a major item of expense, and at least one major athletic director with whom we spoke argued for the elimination of this costly system. This seems quite unlikely given the influence of the pros, but is certainly worthy of consideration.

10. Obtain institutional support of the athletics program.

The athletics programs of Division 2 and 3 institutions generally receive some institutional subsidies because their gate receipts are inadequate to cover the program. There is the anomalous situation in Wisconsin, for example, wherein the athletic programs of every campus in the University system except Madison are supported by State funds. If intercollegiate athletics is a valued part of the educational enterprise, then arguably it should be accorded some measure of support. The historic fact that the major athletic programs were regarded as self-supporting "auxiliary enterprises" should not, so goes the argument, preclude such support. In fact subtle forms of institutional support are beginning to emerge. They take several forms:

- institutional support of all or a portion of the costs operating the physical plant - justified in terms of the multiple use of facilities.
- institutional support of women's intercollegiate athletics - the cost of which is rapidly increasing.
- institutional absorption of some financial aid costs such as fee remissions.
- institutional assuption of athletic deficits (e.g., Northwestern and the Minnesota proposal).
- a mandatory student activity fee - all or a portion of the proceeds of which to go to intercollegiate athletics.

It is likely that these more subtle forms of subsidy will have more appeal to university administrators than "line item" appropriations for the athletic program, which could stimulate considerable faculty and student opposition.

Of particular importance at this moment is the financing of women's intercollegiate athletics programs. Historically, women's programs have grown up in generally under-funded departments of physical education for women. The programs were underfinanced, and the facilities were generally inferior to those available to men. Federal legislation and court decisions are all tending now to insist on equal access to all facilities, and the movement to greatly increase the support of women's intercollegiate programs is underway. Expenditures this year are often in the $20,000 to $50,000 range, and the 74-75 budget discussions now underway frequently call for at least doubling this level of expenditures. The common pattern up to this point has been for either the athletics department or, more frequently, the President to provide the funds. As the ante is raised, however, this becomes more difficult. Athletic directors are mostly supportive of the effort to expand women's intercollegiate programs, but they fear that this may be done at the expense of the men's programs. The ultimate logic of the present women's athletics movement is separate but budgetarily equal programs (and a few co-ed programs). If intercollegiate athletics has to be self-supporting and also include women's programs, then this could certainly be fatal to some men's programs.

The movement will go in one of two ways in the future. One, the women's program will be separately funded and administered, with general institutional support and routed through the women's physical education department. Alternatively, it will be included within the athletic departments, with an associate or co-directorship of the athletic department, accompanied by a university commitment to support the athletic department. The "co-opting" of women by the intercollegiate athletic department is probably a wise move by an athletic director shrewd enough to accompany such a move with a pitch for university support directed primarily at the women's programs. It now only opens the door to a politically palatable form of university support, but it also probably results in the women becoming major supporters of the men's program, the survival of which will be seen as essential to the advancement of the women's program.

11. Raise more private funds.

There are a few institutions, notably Notre Dame, which as a matter of principle do not raise private funds to support the athletics program directly, but most institutions now have major efforts to attract such funds. The state institutions have generally not been as aggressive as the private schools in this regard. The most successful conference in the nation in terms of private fund raising has been the Atlantic Coast Conference, partly because this conference has small stadia and has had to have private support to carry its programs and partly because of a long tradition of private giving for these institutions. In our review we found that for major public institutions $200,000 to $250,000 was about the most that could be raised in the form of gifts, while at some of the major private (e.g., Stanford and USC), the figure reaches as high as $400,000 to $500,000 per year. It is our general impression that in most institutions private fund raising for annual budgets has been pressed as far as it can be. Bricks and mortar are always appealing to prospective donors eager for recognition, and is still fruitful.

There is some sentiment that it may be possible to raise private funds to support the newly emerging women's programs, though it is still too early to know if this will be possible. In any event better private fund raising should not generally be regarded as an important solution to the financial problem of intercollegiate athletics except for those major institutions with support well below the figures indicated above.

## Some Thoughts about Further Study

Basically, the question is not one of further study because the facts about the financial problems of intercollegiate athletics are well known. It would be quite worthwhile to update the Raiborn study with four additional years of data, and this would not be particularly costly nor time consuming. The protocols for that study are available, and it was well designed and well presented. Thus, our first recommendation is to update the Raiborn study.

Beyond that, it is essential that each institution set forth a five to ten year projection of expenditures and income. We believe that such a projection will bring home rather vividly the cold truth that not many athletic programs in this nation can survive more than five to ten more years with the present revenue configurations. With this assertion in mind, our third recommendation is that the chief executive officers (Presidents or Chancellors) of each conference develop a conference-wide strategy for approaching the financial problem. It is essential that this be approached by the chief executive officers, and on a conference-wide basis. It is simply not politically feasible for one institution within a conference to take a major step to cut back a program when, in doing so, it puts itself at a competitive disadvantage.

A fourth recommendation is to develop a plan for women's intercollegiate athletics within the same five to ten year horizon as has been suggested above. Whether this plan leads to roughly equal expenditures within a given time period will be dependent on the aspirations of particular institutions, but in virtually all cases women's programs will be a major factor in the future. Whether such programs will be administered in the athletic department or elsewhere is less relevant than the need for a financial plan.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, it is simply not realistic in the years ahead to expect many major institutions to support athletic programs from gate receipts, radio and television income, and private fund raising for athletic purposes. The uncontrolled nature of costs and the elasticity of demand for the product militate against this. Thus, institutions will have to address themselves to some combination of institutional subsidies and program reductions. Of the latter, the most attractive to us is to chip away at grant-in-aid costs with the ultimate objective of eliminating athletic grants-in-aid and putting athletes on the same basis as other students, though we would have no objection to counting athletic participation as campus employment for purposes of financial aid packaging.

These steps would give proper budgetary recognition to the importance of intercollegiate athletics - something long-recognized in institutions not dependent on gate receipts for the support of programs - and would counteract some of the more insidious aspects of the pressure to win. While we recognize that the pressure to win is inherent in the American psyched and will be present in most worthy programs, it seems unarguable that it is found in extremis in many institutions. Coaches under pressure from athletic directors under pressure from alumni will inevitably transmit this pressure to athletes. "Putting fannys in the seats" is not a complete explanation of the pressure on coaches, but it is an important and educationally undesirable pressure. The joy of competition and of play needs to be restored. Making intercollegiate athletics less of a business and more of an extra-curricular educational experience would be a big step forward. While we have expressed a preference for the form that the reduction of program and expenditures should take, we have no particular preference for the forms of institutional subsidy. They will vary between institutions.

Finally, we recognize that whatever is done within institutions and within conferences must be done with a minimum of fanfare so as to avoid the kind of controversy which would destroy the effort. The professionalization of collegiate athletics has come as the result of enormously formidable political realities which must be reckoned with in any cutback era. It will take skillful and quiet politicking to change the situation. Sweeping recommendations and drastic cuts would be neither efficacious nor in the interests of athletics.

If further study of the financial question is deemed necessary as ammunition for those wanting to change the status quo, we do have a few thoughts beyond the already expressed recommendation that the Raiborn study be updated:

1. The Raiborn study could be supplemented by case studies of three or four institutions in five or six of the major conferences. We would suggest Pacific 8, Big 10, Big 8, Atlantic Coast, Ivy League, Southeast and Southwest Conferences.

2. The case studies would draw upon the institutional data supplied to the updated Raiborn study, and would be somewhat more qualitative in nature, examing attitudes toward the financial problem of athletics by trustees, administrators, faculty members, students, alumni, and the athletic power structure.

3. We recommend a systematic effort to survey the attitudes of chief executive officers within the Conferences selected for case studies. The effort would be to try to categorize their opinions on the financial crunch and their attitudes toward possible solutions.

APPENDIX C

# THE STATE POLITICS OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

Jerry Beasley
1019 Temple Street
Hinton, West Virginia
25951
March 15, 1974
(304) 466-2454

The special taste that the men of democratic times entertain for physical enjoyments is not naturally opposed to the principles of public order; nay, it often stands in need of order that it might be gratified. Nor is it adverse to regularity of morals, for good morals contribute to public tranquility and are favorable to industry. It may even be frequently combined with a species of religious morality; men wish to be as well off in this world without foregoing their chance of another. Some physical gratifications cannot be indulged in without crime; from such they (Americans) strictly abstain. The enjoyment of others is sanctioned by religion and morality; to these the heart, the imagination, and life itself are unreservedly given up, till, in snatching at these lesser gifts, men lose sight of their more precious possessions which constitute the glory and greatness of mankind.

--Alexis de Tocqueville

The Morrill Act of 1861 is recognized as a milestone in the history of American higher education. Part of the ideological baggage which attended the movement culminating in the Act was inherent in the agrarian-democratic tradition. Much of the rhetoric suggested that the newly created universities would be taken to "the people." Concomitant with this movement were the first indications that intercollegiate athletics would flourish; it is significant that the two developments began almost simultaneously. Revisionist interpretations of the early Land Grant history suggest that the institutions which were born during this time were not as democratic as the early publicity contended they would be. However, athletics do seem to have aided in providing a proper democratic veneer to the colleges and universities. One statement of the Land Grant philosophy was the Wisconsin Idea. While the crux of the Wisconsin Idea -- the Land Grant philosophy incarnate -- was to make education available to all people of the state, it is notable that the University's football fight song, "On, Wisconsin," has become better known.

The gradual development of a national academic market created divided loyalties for these publicly supported institutions. While professors began to circulate among colleagues in national associations and students from other states began to be attracted by the low costs, athletics survived as one link with alumni and other local sources of sustenance. Prominence in an academic discipline seldom required the kind of applied research which would take the scholar into a nearby community. As pressures for conformity to scholarly folkways and standards intensified, the athletic establishment was increasingly expected to mollify locals.

Athletics, then, as viewed by some members of academe, are a buffer from the vagaries of public sentiment and fulfill in many respects the same function as a board of trustees. They tend to focus society's attention on the periphery of the university while enabling controversial work of the faculty to continue within the confines of the institution. Historically, there has been another related, but perhaps unintended consequence of the presence of athletics. Lawrence Veysey has contended that the early survival of the university depended partially on the naar oblivion of its constituents to one another. Football and other extracurricular activities may have provided a common external focus for faculty and students diverting their attention from certain internal affairs. As long as they could remain hostile to, or friends of, a symbol which carried their name into battle outside the institution would they be distracted from jealousies and altercations which inevitably arose within the university.

It was during this embryonic period that state legislators began to take a keen interest in higher education, particularly in athletics. Success on the playing fields gradually became equated with success in the legislative halls. Since that time, conventional wisdom has held that often legislative generosity is contingent on the records of the athletic teams of state-supported institutions. Many reputable state university presidents, while abhoring the consequences of big-time athletics, have believed that successful teams were good advertisements. More recently, legislative friends of higher education have reluctantly admitted that they feel that athletics are a "good public relations gimmick for getting more money for our colleges."

Although there is seldom a one-to-one relationship between belief and fact, the former is important because it often informs action. However, the small amount of empirical evidence which is available suggests a weak relationship between benefactions and athletics as a promotional technique. Arnaud C. Marts found in a study conducted during the late 1920's that intercollegiate athletics were not profitable for a group of average-size institutions which cultivated them for this purpose. A simple correlational analysis of the football and basketball records of major state-supported institutions and subsequent increases in legislative appropriations (1959-1968) indicates a small and statistically insignificant positive relationship between the two variables (see Table I). If the analysis had been controlled for enrollment shifts, chances are good that the evidence of the relationship would be negligible. Legislative appropriations to higher education during the 1959-1968 period were quite sensitive to flows of students. Of course, it is not unreasonable to suppose that student migratory patterns may vary with intercollegiate athletic records. Even the Yales, who are not prone to being disconsolate about prospective enrollments, feel that a victory

## TABLE I[3]

| | I | II | III | IV | V |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | 1 | .2175 | .6225 | .2365 | .2160 |
| II | | 1 | .0145 | .2294 | .1159 |
| III | | | 1 | .1939 | .1131 |
| IV | | | | 1 | .4654 |
| V | | | | | 1 |

| | |
|---|---|
| I | Winning percentage football (1959-1968) |
| II | Winning percentage basketball (1959-1968) |
| III | Number times in national top ten, football |
| IV | Elazar-Sharkansky political culture scale[1] |
| V | Percentage increase in state appropriation (1959-1969)[2] |

over Harvard in "The Game" assists in enticing a handful of vacillating mutual applicants into the New Haven fold.

While the impact of winning teams on the financial disposition of legislators is virtually imperceptible, the destinies of politicians and athletes are subject to a similar, if not the same, set of social forces. Each, at various times, have been dependent upon the other for succor. Yet they have had their share of lover's quarrels. In fact, the current upsurge in divorce rate pales beside the frequent disaffections between solons and the athletic establishment. Divorce will never occur because the two were never married. Intercollegiate athletics has been the mistress of many state legislatures, sureptiously supported by public subsidies, but unlike a mistress, publicly enjoyed. This survey indicates that the public has begun to demand a marriage or at least some evidence of the extent to which the public vice/pleasure or need (depending upon one's persuasion) is supported.

It should be no surprise that many state legislators and the athletic establishment are so entwined. Similar epithets have been hurled at both. Thomas Desmond called state legislators "dinosaurs;" athletes were barbarians to Thorstein Veblen. Both have been commended for thier "Horatio-like courage" and for the accomplishment of "Herculean tasks." Among the more cherished gambits in a politician's repertory of means of identifying with constituents is the sports metaphor. Credit for actually having participated is a bonus worth claiming no matter how limited the involvement.[4] There are many variations on the theme, some of which do not always redound to the benefit of the story's protagonist.

A cursory review of the history of American higher education from the emergence of the university to present reveals that politics and athletics had a close, if not always harmonious, relationship. However, the tendency to generalize from anectdotal evidence has provided material for a mythology which obfuscates the real nature of the association. Single causes are assigned behavior which is often the confluence of a complex set of social factors. The resulting interpretations have sometimes been a disservice to politician and athlete alike. Several examples illustrate the point.

1. In 1870 the Massachusetts Agricultural College's baseball victory over Harvard prompted a contemporary commentator to submit that it "marked the agricultural school as a real college." The chronicler of the incident noted that soon thereafter the Legislature increased its appropriations accordingly. A reader of the history cannot escape the impression that the Legislature's liberality was the result of the athletic accomplishment. Although this is an attractive explanation, that agricultural colleges across the country were being lavished with increased support from state legislatures warrants note.

2. A recent article in a Maryland newspaper reported that the State Legislature was contemplating narrowing the University of Maryland's discretion in fiscal matters. The

article implied that much of the University's autonomy in these affairs had been acquired two decades ago when the institution was a national football power. That may very well have been the case. However, an unsuspecting reader is left with the impression that the current concern of the legislature was motivated by winless football at the University. Scrutiny of the particular circumstances prompting legislative action reveals that several of the catalysts are present in other states and have had comparable effects; for example, institutional control of federal dollars and the maintenance of presidential mansions and personal staff.

## Athletics: A Manipulatable Symbol for State Politicians

It is almost passe to mention the frequency which recurring situations in government are held analogous to athletics. Allusion to team sports is most common. (Although news pictures suggest that jogging is popular among public servants, few of these leaders ever make reference to the "loneliness of the long distance runner.") Implicit is the assumption that all will recognize the speaker as the "playmaker" or the "quarterback."

Many politicians, while not understanding the nuances of the games, recognize potential in athletics for garnering votes. Historically, several governors have tried to "use" state universities for this purpose.

While Huey Long was Governor of Louisiana, he affectionately referred to LSU as "my university." Among other things, he was interested in the development of a first-rate band which could be the pride of the State. Every good band ought to have a decent football team to complement it, he reasoned. Therefore, Long set out to get a team for the Tigers. Characteristic of his other endeavors, he did not spare passion or energy in this pursuit. Undaunted by his early ignorance of the game, Long was soon giving rousing halftime speeches to the players.[5]

Long probably viewed the LSU football team as one vehicle for carrying him into the national political arena.[6] To acquire national prominence LSU had to play a team of undisputed stature. Thus Army was scheduled. The "Kingfish" choreographed the rest of the show with the possible exception of a sound licking at the hands of the Cadets. Nonetheless, football at LSU entered the so-called big-time.

While Long's antics in Louisiana were relatively innocuous, one other governor was willing to disrupt the operation of the entire state university in order to field better athletic teams. At least he used athletics to rationalize his action. M. M. Neely, a former Governor of West Virginia, appeared before a special meeting of the West Virginia University Board of Governors to make a personal plea for a change in the President of the University. Subsequently, he defended his stand in a statewide radio broadcast. Emphasis was put on the mediocrity of the athletic program at the University and its unattractiveness to West Virginia athletes. The Governor found the University's lack of national acclaim especially worrisome. Intercollegiate athletics have probably never received as grandiloquent support as in Neely's speech:

> Duty, judgment and conscience jointly warned me with trumpet voice that temperizing should end at once and reform should begin without delay. If you desire that the University may be lifted high above the Dead Sea level of inferiority in which visionless greed has long kept it, and that it be made a fountain of everflowing blessing for you and your children after you, join me in this important fight for reform, and help render an inesteemable service to all the average men and women of the state.[7]

Two cases doth neither damnation nor commendation make, but they do pose questions. The first and obvious question: has gubernatorial interest in intercollegiate athletics persisted? If yes, then what are the consequences for athletics and higher education in general?

There is evidence that some governors still relish an identification with the intercollegiate athletic enterprise. One has to be careful, though, not to generalize about all fifty states from the experience of a few. Several examples might prove instructive.

1. The governor of one state has earmarked income from invested federal revenue sharing funds for the construction of a new football stadium for the state university.

2. The governor of a Midwest state has discouraged a move by six state colleges to form a new athletic conference which would exclude a predominately black institution.

3. Several governors have been willing to lend their prestige to recruitment and fund-raising efforts. Usually, the major state university is the recipient of this kind of assistance.

4. A report of the Carnegie Commission, Campus and Capitol, intimates that in one state the football record of

the state university influences state elections in ways which are not usually unnoticed by incumbent governors.

5. The governor's budget analyst in another Midwestern state, after identifying the extent of state subsidy for intercollegiate athletics, has recommended "user's fees" as a potential alternate means of financing the programs.

On balance, it appears that the nature of gubernatorial responsibilities tends to make the state university the object of attention when governors choose to become involved in athletic affairs. Governors in states with several large, competing universities are more hesitant in allying themselves with particular institutions.

The context in which state legislators work creates a set of concerns dissimilar from those of the governor. Obligations to a local constituency requires legislators to give a modicum of attention to state colleges and more recently to community colleges.[8]

Since line items for intercollegiate athletics have ordinarily not been included in budgetary requests, capital outlay decisions frequently reflect the concerns of legislators. Examination of state budget documents produced during the 1960's suggests that logrolls occurred from time to time with respect to capital projects for athletic purposes. If one institution got a swimming-gymnasium complex funded one year, it was not unusual to find that the next year other institutions would request and receive support for similar undertakings.

That which masquerades as a logroll to individuals with cynical proclivities is viewed as equity by their more generous bretheren. The label may be unimportant, but the consequences are significant. Because of excessive aspirations during the last decade, many institutions are now trying to support comprehensive programs and facilities with insufficient resources. A few legislators may have visited injury upon athletic programs they intended to nurture. Institutional presidents maintain that this assistance was proffered sometimes with and as frequently without the blessing of the institution. A case of the latter has wormed its way into the current session of a state legislature. As a result, the administration of an institution has been placed in the awkward position of opposing legislation which would provide a facility for its basketball games. The legislator who introduced the bill saw the local university as means of extracting support for a local municipal center. The bill will probably not be enacted because other members of the legislature feel that it would augment an already onerous student fee structure.

This case exposes a common characteristic of state-supported colleges and universities. In some respects they are hostages of the communities in which they reside. The university's immobility makes it vulnerable in the bargaining which takes place in state legislatures. Several years ago a state senator introduced a bill which would have enabled local governments to levy an entertainment tax on gate receipts from events attended by two thousand people or more. The legislator represented the district in which the state university was located. Although the bill did not pass, it raises issues which may return to haunt university officials. Since, as many university administrations contend, intercollegiate athletics is an "auxiliary enterprise" or business run separately from the academic programs of the institutions, should it not be subject to the same local taxes which other businesses pay? Or, should not the portion of university property dedicated to these purposes be assessed for local tax purposes?

## Intercollegiate Athletics: A "Goblet Issue" for Legislatures

A common assertion, often emanating from academe, is that intercollegiate athletics are a "mirror of society." The implicitly pejorative nature of that contention often suggests that the university has little control over what is attached to it. Such a perspective seldom reveals little more than the cynical world view of some members of the academic community. Their turn of argument usually attempts to indict intercollegiate athletics, stressing that they are a parasitic type of disease which has attached itself to higher education, not an infection which has festered from within nor a response to needs felt by members of the university community. This argument not only oversimplifies the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and higher education, but consequences of its acceptance may be detrimental to the entire educational enterprise. The reasons for this merit brief explication.

Lay persons are often given the responsibility for judging the effectiveness of professionals. Inhibiting that decision-making process are professional claims of esoteric knowledge which imply the desirability of self-regulation. A few recent incursions into their domain notwithstanding, academicians have been generally successful in convincing state legislators that the technical core of colleges and universities, instruction and research, can best be evaluated by members of the institution, particularly faculty. Yet, legislators still must have some means of maintaining a semblance of control over the institutions for which they are ultimately responsible. In much the same fashion as other lay persons who are asked to evaluate professionals, legislators develop simple decision rules with which they become comfortable over a period of years.[9] For example, in many cases legislators prefer the certainty of current enrollments vis a vis projected figures as a basis for appropriations. The general rule is to find a "goblet issue," something they know about. Using essentially the same method of reasoning which statisticians employ, legislators make inferences about the unknown from the known. Intercollegiate athletics is one area in which legislators share a good deal of knowledge; it, then, is seen as a "mirror" of many institutions. That intercollegiate athletics should be such an issue is as much a tribute to the success of the promotional campaign of the institution as it is the legislators' interest.

When university presidents and other professional educators are confronted with this seeming preoccupation with trivia, their chagrin conceals a failure of a large part of the higher educational community. Until a reliable, comprehensible technology is developed for evaluating outcomes of the instructional process, legislators will have to content themselves with a focus on the periphery of higher education.

This situation led Jacques Barzun to write wistfully that academics should attempt to discover rigorous standards of discrimination which are equal to the ones applied to college athletes. Of course, instruction is not, or probably should not be, a zero sum contest, but many legislators do feel that purposes and outcomes can be more artfully articulated than at present.

If athletics are viewed as one measure of an impenetrable institution's internal affairs, then the serious repercussions resulting from abdication of control of the program are underscored. A paradox emerges too. Institutions which yield to public pressure for changes in the athletic program in return for expected increases in support for other programs run a high risk of incurring criticism of the latter regardless of merit. Finally, institutions which have heeded the advice of legislators and other influentials in athletic matters have found they have created similar expectations with respect to other policy areas.[10]

## Legislative Inaction

State records show that legislators have introduced only a small number of bills which relate directly to intercollegiate athletics. Why, then, despite ostensibly broad and intense interest, has so little been done formally to foster or to regulate this domain? Several proposed explanations deserve consideration.

One explanation relates to the nature of legislators. Legislators _qua_ legislators have a small input into a relatively large system; i.e. the legislature itself. Therefore, the individual legislator often prefers to deal with an issue in a personal rather than formal fashion or in a forum which is most likely to respond positively to his initiatives. As parent, alumnus, or worker the legislator assumes other roles and has access to other decision-making bodies.[11] In alternative roles outside the legislature, the legislator is often accorded status and influence he cannot claim otherwise. Since many universities and colleges are willing to accede to certain personal demands of legislators which they view as relatively cheap, there is no cause to carry the issue to the capitol for resolution. In sum, the legislator controls the possibility of trouble and uses this as a lever to get institutions to do relatively minor things which are important to him but unimportant to the university. Since many of the issues relating to athletics tend to be important to the legislator but unimportant to the central administrations of institutions,[12] it follows that very few issues end up being resolved within the formal decision making process of the state legislature.

A counter theory has been proposed by a legislator. He suggests that the appearance of external influence is an artifice devised by cunning university presidents to maintain control of athletics while shifting the responsibility for consequences of bad decisions to legislators and alumni. First, there is rarely a clear alumni or public mandate for institutional action on athletics. That support which is available is sufficiently diffuse to neutralize the influence of any single benefactor. In the confusion that ensues, the university does as it pleases.

A second explanation stresses the attitudes of legislators. Where intercollegiate athletics have been most popular, there co-exists a uniquely parochial ideological commitment of legislators. They see themselves as representing institutions in their districts rather than the general welfare of all of higher education in the state. In effect, the legislator becomes a neutral conduit through which local requests flow. When these same legislators are interested in athletics, they hesitate to vent problems publicly for fear of jeopardizing the status which is already accorded sports. Among those who are interested in athletics, a few feel that they will be able to do more if little fanfare is given their activity. They reason that the best way for a legislator to help cultivate athletic programs is by doing nothing, or appearing to have done nothing. The self-support myth has provided a satisfactory rationale for this posture.

In some states, athletics are obviously popular, but deemed unworthy of the attention of state legislators. Legislators tend to have role models which dictate the types of concern they should have. Taxation, welfare, education and industrialization leave little room for athletics, especially since professional educators have argued that intercollegiate competition is not part of the educational process. However, some legislators have become interested in athletic problems when they have coincided with other, widely-held values which have forceful spokesmen. For example, concern has been expressed over the television rights for intercollegiate contests. In several cases where commercial stations were competing with educational stations legislatures have acted to assure the former's access to the market. During a public budget hearing in another legislature, the finance committee formally commended the athletic director at the state university for contracting with a commercial station.

There is a final and compelling argument for the relative inaction of state legislatures in athletic affairs. It suggests that most legislators are concerned about the problems of intercollegiate athletics, especially problems of more recent vintage, but they are convinced that they can only be suitably resolved in other forums. These problems can best be addressed in Congress or by an appropriate organization whose scope of operation is national. Each state does not want to hamper its university in competition with other state universities; harnessing it with strict regulations would have that effect. If we move unilaterally, "we would be putting our necks in a noose." For similar reasons state legislators have waited for strict federal regulations to curb industrial pollution and strip mining. They fear they will place their businesses at a competitive disadvantage in a national market.

The above arguments may partially explain the dearth of formal legislative action on intercollegiate athletics and may also give a clue to the nature of intervention which has occurred.

To the extent that the state politics of athletics resembles in many ways the highly personalized, informal style which described anti-New Deal urban politics can we expect the policy outputs to place a similar premium on people. Hence, implicit in much of the sport legislation introduced during the last decade has been the recognition of the athlete and occasionally the coach as a resource of the state. This outcome may be as much a function of advancing technology in related fields as it is a consequence of any unique properties of intercollegiate athletics. Economists and educationists have supported eloquent arguments with hard data to demonstrate the effects of human capital differentials; measurement of human resources has also become fashionable in the accounting profession. Prompted perhaps by this work, several professional athletes have tried to claim capital depreciation on their bodies. More likely, legislators have been spurred by the same kind of pride which resulted in Brazil's declaration of Pele, its world renowned soccer player, as a national resource.

Legislation thus inspired appears in several general forms. Although many bills of this nature have been precipitated by concrete incidents, they reflect the legislator's desire to preserve the quality of athletic teams despite sometimes overlooking the rights of the individual athlete. One genre of bills, which has been unsuccessful in terms of enactment record, seeks to insulate underclass athletes from the lures of recruiters representing professional organizations. The rationale for a Texas bill of this nature rested on twin concerns: for student-athletes' completion of the full college course and for the manner in which professional contracts tended "to corrupt the morals of young men ... and disrupt collegiate athletic programs." This bill and a similar one in Kentucky were introduced subsequent to the signing of a prominent college athlete.

The amateur athlete is not the sole focus of legislative interest. Upon the resignation of the basketball coach at the State University, the West Virginia House of Delegates passed a resolution urging Jerry West, presently employed by the Los Angeles Lakers, to consider the position. In part, the resolution states that West (a former West Virginian) "not only brought fame, honor and riches upon himself, but has brought prestige and acclaim to the state of West Virginia by his performance, ideals and sportsmanship."

The rare bill which is introduced relating to intercollegiate athletics has usually been one result of a particular incident. As legislation which is hurriedly drafted and passed in the wake of natural disasters, these bills are narrow in scope. An example, which joins the bills to limit professional recruiting practices, is a Kansas statute which prohibits the alteration of an athlete's academic records.

Combined effects of limited formal attention and personalism have a major consequence aside from siring narrowly conceived remedies for present problems. The entire network of intrastate relationships in which intercollegiate athletics are embedded is highly personalized. Whether individuals in this enterprise are actually as important and influential as they seem to be is academic. Individuals are perceived as important by legislators. Therefore, it becomes natural to associate problems with individuals. With the scapegoating which follows as the night the day comes an almost inevitable train of simplistic solutions. Thus, legislators feel no compelling reason to act on problems as long as culpable individuals are identified and dismissed.

Since many state legislators key their interest on allocation patterns, their concern for intercollegiate athletics tends to fix on the fiscal. Although a few legislatures have shown a new restraint during the past several years toward capital outlays for intercollegiate athletics, much of the recent activity has been devoted to assuring that the athletic programs of state-supported institutions remain solvent. Rarely has there been malice aforethought when legislators have asked institutions to report the amount of state subsidy. In the few states where accounting systems have been geared to identifying these costs, many legislators have accepted the subsidy as a legitimate burden of the state.

Contrary to the belief of the proponents of full disclosure of the state subsidy (by identification in the budget) of intercollegiate athletics, there is evidence to suggest that this alternative may exacerbate older problems. Identification of athletics in budgetary requests, especially in states where lump sum appropriations are made to institutions, subjects the issues to a radically different process of negotiation.

There is an adage, bandied about by politicians, which is relevant to this issue and may shed some light on the possible consequences of the disclosure strategy: "it's not what you do in politics that counts, but what you get credit for doing."[13] One consequence of this attitude is the ceremony which often attends political activity. Simple solutions to complex problems are given dignity by the rituals in which they are embedded. Moreover, the appearance of right or decisive action is more often important than the quality and consequences of the action, since action and consequences are so easily separable. Recent experience in two states is suggestive of consequences of the disclosure stratagem.

In Tennessee and New Mexico athletics have been specifically isolated in the budgetary process. In New Mexico, after the new line item was introduced in the budget request to the legislature, an interesting simplification process, characteristic of much legislative decision making, began to operate. Although the justifiable needs of the State institutions varied -- due to different travel requirements and attendance rates -- demands for the appearance of equity have resulted in equal allocations for the state colleges. In Tennessee, the Higher Education Commission's formula for generating budget requests provides $40,000 each for the athletic programs of state colleges.

Identification as a separate line item in higher education budgets at the state level may have two other consequences. If all sports are identified, the minor ones may begin to burgeon as a result of the inertia of governmental budgeting. The beneficent incremental drive of the budget would tend to sweep these items along. However, that same inertia may make it difficult to eliminate a sport because money has been provided annually for that purpose. Budgetary inflexibilities may impede the diversion of those funds to other institutional activities.

The impetus behind many of the objections to state expenditures for intercollegiate athletics stems from the decline in local influence. Rosters of many state university teams have shown a marked increase in the number of out-of-state players. If athletics were a crucial link with locals, even it is being weakened by large-scale recruitment efforts. One state budget officer volunteered that the thing which offended his sensibilities most was having to approve out-of-state travel requests for recruiting trips. Although a large number of state-funded scholarships have historically been awarded to athletes, this practice did not become objectionable until there occurred a substantial overlap in out-of-state and athletic categories, notably in Wisconsin and Colorado. In light of this concern, it is interesting to note that Oklahomans, when questioned about the altered high school transcript of an OU football player, point out with some relief that the lad is a Texan.

## The Coach As Politician

It may belabor the obvious to say that one does not have to be an elected official to be a politician. It may not be so readily apparent that there are advantages to being a politician without a public office. Many of the traits which are required to woo young athletes help a coach develop a following around a state and even a region. Not a few legislators probably covet the multitude of banquet speaking engagements received by coaches.

A Southern senator once proffered his formula for a successful speech. He counseled neophytes to quote the Bible, Shakespeare, and the Constitution; many coaches have managed to master at least two of these elements of style. Where preachers use the oil of football analogies, the sociologist can expect the coach to use the salve of Biblical anectdotes At least one coach enhanced his reputation in a rural state by frequenting the pulpits of churches in the vicinity of his institution. He apparently knew whereof he spoke when he told Monday morning quarterbacks where to go.

The popularity of coaches is not without consequence in some state legislatures. I talked with several legislators bent on minor reforms of intercollegiate athletics who felt that their efforts were for naught because of the influence of certain well-entrenched coaches. In several states, a few legislators contend that after the governor, the state university football coach is best known. In this context, a few legislators are reluctant to ask questions about an institution's athletic program. Many of these legislators would welcome an effort at the federal level which would give currency to their views.

## A New Factor in the Equation: Statewide Governing and Coordinating Boards.

When the first Carnegie study of intercollegiate athletics was published in 1929, there were five statewide higher education governing boards. During the last two decades, statewide governing and coordinating boards have proliferated across the country. Their interaction with legislatures in the policy formulation process has important consequences for intercollegiate athletics. An understanding of the impetus behind their creation and the powers they have been given is critical in assessing their real and potential influence.

Their birth has been a response to the magnitude of public higher education problems, to the absolute growth of the public sector, to the need to arrest the upward spiraling cost of state-supported institutions, to the need felt by legislators to reduce the number of controversial issues which they were asked to resolve and finally, to the acknowledged lack of expert advice available to many legislatures. These boards ordinarily serve -- at least initially -- as an intermediary between the legislative and executive branches and the individual institutions. They have been granted varying degrees of power, from fulfilling advisory capacities to the full governing responsibility for the daily operations of all public institutions in a state. The trend across the country is toward increasing power and centralization in these boards. In fact, of the fifty statutory changes which have been made in the form of state-wide coordination during the last two decades, all but two have augmented the power of these boards. Primary among a variety of responsibilities assumed by these boards are budgeting, programming, and planning. Although planning has been urged as the most critical function, it appears that once created, budgetary responsibilities become more urgent and most likely to attract the attention of the professional staff. Since these boards have no alumni and no pre-existing political constituencies, their viability is tenously insured by awkward and shifting alliances.

The policy priorities of these boards is difficult to ascertain from their public documents. The symbolic or ultimate goals for higher education which they articulate are essentially the same as those mentioned by state legislators. However, their operational concerns, as manifest in their annual reports to the Education Commission of the State, have been several. Intercollegiate athletics has not been among the twenty-five most pressing issues listed for each of the past few years.

Although it is difficult to assay the future of these boards, we may venture several predictions. It appears that increased demands on higher education resulting from shrinking resources will justify the existence of the boards as a forum for increased interinstitutional, joint decision making.[14] If their history parallels that of other governmental regulatory agencies, they in all likelihood will gradually be captured by the institutions they were created to control.

Therefore, they may become war councils where institutional presidents can devise plans for their annual assault on the state legislature. However, with competent, professional staff these boards, with institutional cooperation, may still have the opportunity to frame policy choices in new ways for legislatures. And finally, during times of financial stringency, these agencies may be the arena in which peripheral types of programs will try to gain legitimacy. For example, it is not without the realm of possibility that intercollegiate athletic programs would intensify their efforts to become a formal part of the curriculum. Capital outlays for intercollegiate athletic facilities are already being justified on educational grounds. Although athletics have not been important to these boards, their preoccupation with cost reduction will probably result in analyses of athletic programs. The Illinois Board of Higher Education has already designated involuntary physical education as a low program priority making it susceptible to budget cuts. Similarly, the increasing popularity of zero-base budgeting may very well turn the jeweller's eye on intercollegiate athletics.

With interested legislators generally inactive in any formal capacity, governors ordinarily willing to make only token gestures, university presidents paradoxically yielding responsibility in the name of autonomy, and state-wide boards of higher education largely ignoring intercollegiate athletics because they feel pressed by more urgent issues demanding resolution, it is remarkable that any state level authority has begun to examine the problems of intercollegiate athletics and to act. However, officials in a handful of states have reacted to grumblings about the condition of athletics. Legislators, legislative agencies, and state-wide coordinating boards have moved singly and jointly in an effort to identify and to solve problems which relate to the state support of intercollegiate programs. While the state-wide boards have been the first to address the problem, their efforts, have proven futile without the support of legislators.

The recent history of the older, stronger and more vital of these state boards may offer a clue to the future disposition of fledgling boards toward intercollegiate athletics.

Usually the first task undertaken by the staff of newly formed boards is the creation of a data base for managerial decisions. Several principles have guided this effort. Being placed in the midst of the state budgetary cycle and being expected to produce well-documented recommendations concerning the needs of higher education combine to create a sense of urgency which has often resulted in the use of existing instruments for the collection of information. As a result, many boards now have accounting systems which were tailored originally for individual institutions. ACE's College and University Business Management has had an unmistakable influence on fiscal officers of state boards. Many use its accounting categories with few questions of relevance and its narrative without citation. Classification of intercollegiate athletics as an auxiliary enterprise has become conventional wisdom due in part to this publication. Few, if any, considerations are given the behavioral implications of classificatory systems. The adoption of information systems which may have suited the needs of some people in some places has proved a liability to several state boards, particularly when the information requested concerns intercollegiate athletics. In the mid 1960's, the Virginia Council on Higher Education appealed unsuccessfully to the Governor in its effort to require all public institutions in the state to report lateral transfers from educational and general funds to intercollegiate athletics.

Much of the detailed information required for the management of single institutions is simply not relevant to the decisions made by legislators and state boards. For example, the New Mexico Board of Higher Educational Finance discovered that much of the data collected on athletic revenues and expenditures were superfluous. Even ardent advocates of tight controls at the state level hesitate to recommend that all revenues be reported because they fear that the practice might jeopardize certain benefactions.

Deficiencies of their information systems aside, staff of state-wide boards have taken the lead in exploding the self-support myth. While a few individuals have had a salutary impact, their apparent motives have varied. Drawing on his experience as an institutional researcher at the University of Chicago, John Dale Russell, as Executive Secretary of the New Mexico Board of Higher Educational Finance, studied income and expenditures attributable to athletics. He produced evidence, to the surprise of presidents and legislators alike, showing that no institution had a self-supporting athletic program. After identifying the extent of state subsidy, Dr. Russell argued that the legislature should approve this amount since it was responsible for the use of state tax receipts. The amount was included as a line item in the budget request in order to make the legislature face the question. Actually, the BEF did not want the amount to detract from a substantial salary increase it was recommending for faculty. Rather than confront the issue, the legislature decided to incorporate the item in its lump sum appropriation and gave the board the full amount it had recommended. Several years later, 1959, the legislature decided to use the line item strategy for intercollegiate athletics. During the last five years, that line has increased by 74 percent; for the same period, educational and general appropriations grew by 66 percent.

Most often coordinating boards which have only advisory duties must rely on their accounting systems as an attention directing device. Action resulting from data is predicated on the will of the legislature. And, selective inattention is not an unknown ploy of legislators. Where possible, consequently, these boards try to act in concert with executive and legislative support offices. There are two notable examples which relate to intercollegiate athletics.

In 1969 the Colorado legislature was apprised of a substantial deficit resulting from the operation of intercollegiate athletics at Colorado State University. Instead of granting a supplementary appropriation to render the institution solvent, the legislature authorized a study of the intercollegiate athletic programs in all state colleges and universities. While the committee's report acquitted the athletic department of CSU, it encountered problems of analysis due to accounting snarls. As a result, it did recommend that the Commission on Higher Education develop a standardized format and uniform definitions to be used by all state-supported institutions for reporting athletic transactions.

Cooperation between the legislature and the coordinating board in Colorado is evident in another area. A concern over the distribution of tuition waivers contributed to the legislature's decision to create a state scholarship program to be administered by the Commission on Higher Education. In its request to the legislature, the Commission identifies the amount to be allocated to athletes. The legislature has maintained a careful watch on the amount of funds used to recruit out-of-state athletes.

The Tennessee Higher Education Commission, in cooperation with the State Comptroller and the Department of Finance and Administration, has developed a comprehensive schedule for reporting fiscal data; intercollegiate athletics is included. The schedule does depart from standard practice and classifies athletics as part of the regular operation of the colleges,[15] and only at Memphis State as an auxiliary enterprise. Intercollegiate athletics at the University of Tennessee are operated as a separate corporation. Using data generated from these reports, the Commission has provided for intercollegiate athletics in its budgetary formula.[16]

The interest of state-wide boards in athletics in these states may be exceptional. One board in another state, after producing studies revealing a substantial state subsidy of intercollegiate athletics, has been content to wait mutely until the legislature deighs to act. Since intercollegiate athletics represents only 3 percent of the state budget for the entire system, the board staff reasons that there are other issues which deserve its attention. Another state higher educational agency has produced physical education program cost data which show a wide variation among institutions. Since athletic costs are sometimes camouflaged in physical education programs, further investigation would have been logical. There is no evidence of action taken as a result of the information. Finally, another state-wide board found in a study of high cost programs that physical education was among the five most costly. Again, there is no evidence of a subsequent study for the purpose of ferreting out the causes.

In many respects, the rhetoric of coordinating board staff has the ring of the public pronouncements of early Twentieth Century university presidents which prompted Veblen to call them "captains of erudition."[17] Their common call is for the introduction of sound business principles to the management of higher education. Consistent with the business model, they have creditably addressed the troublesome questions concerning educational productivity. Their studied indifference to intercollegiate athletics is curious inasmuch as it has been classified as an auxiliary enterprise and auxiliary enterprises are generally conceded to be the most business-like aspect of higher education. Although most states have produced what is commonly known as a "master plan" for higher education, not one provides for the future of intercollegiate athletics. The Legislative Auditor's office in Wisconsin has produced one of the few long-range (five years) projections of the needs of athletic programs.[18] The oversight may be a tacit admission that intercollegiate athletics, despite claims to the contrary, cannot be operated as a business operation in many states. One reason for this is reversion statutes which make it virtually impossible to accumulate a financial cushion in year-end balances. It may also be an acknowledgment that in other, more prosperous days, athletics provided support for struggling academic programs. However, short organizational memories make the latter explanation implausible.

Many state officials have shown a marked interest in delegating control of intercollegiate athletics. Before the creation of coordinating boards, legislatures relied heavily on the regional accrediting associations to assist in the maintenance of quality academic programs. In a manner reflecting a similar willingness to give responsibility to quasi-public organizations, several statewide boards have encouraged institutions to join athletic conferences. One legislature, rather than involving itself with the detailed control of intercollegiate athletics, simply passed a resolution encouraging state-supported institutions to follow the "letter and spirit of NCAA regulations. From a fiscal vantage point, one legislature and one governing board have realized that conference affiliation with institutions whose gate receipts are paltry can be a burden to the state. The legislature has created an interim committee to find a satisfactory way of extricating the public institutions from the unsatisfactory arrangement.

Finally, the controversy over women's participation in athletics reveals several of the problems and prospects for state-level action concerning intercollegiate athletics generally.

HEW regulations accompanying Title IX of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 seek to end the separate and unequal treatment of women athletes. Reaction of the states -- legislators, boards of higher education and the athletic establishment -- has been cautious. One legislature passed a resolution asking for "equal treatment" of women athletes. With no instructions regarding the specific actions required to satisfy the "equal treatment" clause, institutions have guardedly held the line on current policy. Atypical is the one legislature which did appropriate funds to begin a gradual reduction in the gap between levels of support for men's and women's programs. The state board of regents in another state has convinced students to assume the financial burden of eliminating discrimination by assessing themselves additional fees. The executive secretary of another state governing board candidly admitted that he intended to take no substantive action until his counterparts in other states provided an example. Such grudging acceptance of this responsibility may force the issue into the courts. The ACLU is studying the possibility of a suit in Nevada.

The movement to root out discrimination against women in athletics introduces two significant general factors which have to be considered when assessing the future of policy formulation for intercollegiate athletics.

First, having acquired the right to vote, students have an opportunity to affect political outcomes directly. Recognizing their potential for influence, students have formed organizations at the state level for the purpose of expressing their concerns. The Associated Student Lobby of the University of California has worked to effect changes which would benefit students as students. Should local campus representatives fail in efforts to equalize treatment of women athletes, the ASL would be prepared to use its resources to assist them at the state level.

Student political organizations are certainly not unique to California. Several groups have been formed in other states. If recent student opinion polls are a precursor of additional issues which will be addressed by these groups, governing boards and legislatures can expect more pointed questions about the mandatory fees levied to support intercollegiate athletics as well as the distribution of general student activity fees.

A second factor, court action, has potentially more far-reaching consequences. Historically, court decisions have influenced the administration of athletic programs in a marginal way. For example, attrition of the sovereign immunity principle has caused some state legislatures to provide liability protection for coaches and institutions and insurance for athletes. If however, a recent article in the Stanford Law Review[19] presages an imminent course of action for the courts, states may no longer yield responsibility for the regulation of intercollegiate athletics to national associations and conferences. The authors have argued that the NCAA's disciplining of institutions for violations of its regulations may constitute "state action," and therefore is required to extend to individuals the due process guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment. Should the courts begin to hold the states indirectly accountable for the actions of these voluntary associations which have assumed public functions, then it is likely that state legislators will begin to formalize their historic interest in intercollegiate athletics by creating intra-state regulatory agencies, as in Kansas, or by vesting this duty in existing governmental agencies.

## Some Conclusive Questions[20]

Clearly the data lacunae in this brief survey allow few conclusions; it does suggest additional questions which will require painstaking research. Due to the informal nature of relationships in and about the athletic community, careful case study analysis of the policies of athletics in several states would be most fruitful.

The following normative and empirical questions might provide the parameters for such studies:

1. What is the magnitude of public subsidy of intercollegiate athletics? Which athletic programs should receive public support? (e.g. particular sports? athletics in private institutions?)

2. What has been the impact of the self-support myth?

3. Are there alternative ways of financing intercollegiate athletics in public institutions (e.g. user's fees)?

4. Is state regulation of intercollegiate athletics preferrable to the quasi-governmental conferences?

5. What are the behavioral implications of accounting systems used by state coordinating and governing boards? If intercollegiate athletics is a business, what are the implications for public policy?

6. What has been the impact of state legislation designed to rid intercollegiate athletics of unethical practices? What prompted it?

7. Is state legislative action perferrable to Congressional action?

8. What social benefits does a state derive from intercollegiate athletics in its public institutions?

## FOOTNOTES

1. Daniel J. Elazar, American Federalism: A View from the States, (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1966) p. 84-85. The scale was constructed by Ira Sharkansky and appeared in his article, "The Utility of Elazar's Political Culture." Elazar has classified states as moralist, individualsist or traditionalist according to perceptions of their orientation to political action, to bureaucracy, to new programs, and to government intervention in the economy. The classifications form a continuum; traditionalist states were assigned high scores. The Southern states clustered at this end.

A study completed by a national citizens' committee ranks state legislatures on five dimensions: representativeness, independence, information, accountability and functional. A composite of these rankings correlates positively (+.415) with the political culture scale. Although there are several exceptions, legislatures which have considered the highest number of bills relating to intercollegiate athletics tend to be in traditionalsit states. Aside from Colorado and Wisconsin, these legislatures tend to have a low composite ranking on the citizens' committee scale.

Although the indices of state characteristics constructed by political scientists and sociologists have shortcomings, they could provide an invaluable framework for a systematic analysis of differences among the states in the treatment of intercollegiate athletics.

2. The Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley, reports that increases in legislative appropriations for higher education (1962-1967) were greatest in the South. The Carnegie Commission has also indicated that state burden for higher education is highest among Southern states. Burden is defined as (state and local taxes/personal income) x (state and local income for higher education/state and local taxes).

3. Data are from sixty-one major state-supported institutions of higher education; they were reported by M.M. Chambers. Aside from the "athletic success-appropriation" relationship, other interesting "tendencies" are evident. As expected, there is a stronger relationship -- although relatively weak statistically -- between football success (I) and legislative appropriations (V) than between basketball success (II) and appropriations. One further observation may merit additional exploration. The relationship between football success (I) and the political culture scale (IV) is stronger than the relationship between football success (I) and the number of times an institution was in the national top ten for football (III). One interpretation suggested by these data is that the

press in traditionalist areas may not have the influence necessary to give acclaim commensurate with the records of the state university teams they most often write about. Dan Jenkins (*Saturday's America*; Little, Brown and Company: Boston, 1970) has discussed regional influences in the selection of Heisman winners.

4. Brooks Hays, former Congressman from Arkansas, was wont to boast of his fifty-five second appearance in the annual Thanksgiving high school game. A congressional colleague, after woeful nodding of the head and ... "only fifty-five seconds." See Hays' delightful compendium of political humor, *Hotbed of Tranquility* (Macmillan Company; New York, 1968).

5. T. Harry Williams, *Huey Long* (Knopf; New York, 1971).

6. *Ibid*.

7. Quoted in J. Douglas Machesney, "The Evolution of Statewide Governance of Higher Education in West Virginia, " an unpublished doctoral dissertation, West Virginia University Archives, 1971.

8. Community college athletics have not received the same kind of support wiich has enabled the sports programs of other state-supported institutions to prosper. One reason may be the extensive local support of the institutions. Another is the fear held by some legislators that good athletes may be diverted from the state's major institutions. Despite the early community college litany which did not include intercollegiate competition and the lack of early state support, these institutions have managed to develop substantial programs. Any national study must analyze the problems unique to these burgeoning institutions.

9. See C.P. Snow's *Science and Government*.

10. The "athletics-as-a-diversion" thesis receives some support from the New Mexico experience. While the New Mexico legislature has been insouciant to the Board of Higher Educational Finance's recommendations concerning appropriations for intercollegiate athletics, it has heeded the Board's advice in other areas.

11. Several of the legislators interview had sons and daughters presently engaged in collegiate athletics; many were former athletes themselves. In Texas, several recent bills relating to intercollegiate athletics have been introduced by former "stars." In at least one instance, a legislator has served as a spokesman for his alma mater, a private institution. By assuring intrastate competition between his institution and other "big-time" universities, he sought to keep "Texas money in Texas."

12. It has been suggested that the legislator's greatest interest is merely in receiving football tickets gratis. Most universities are usually cooperative. However, the ploy of one state university president generated some ill-feeling. In addition to giving tickets

to members of the legislature, the president decided to give tickets to individuals running against them in the fall elections. However, incumbents were seated on the fifty yard line; their opponents in ground-level seats at the goal line. It was a poor year for the party-in-power and no doubt, the president's prestige suffered a bit as well!

13. See Murray Edelman, *The Symbolic Uses of Politics*, University of Illinois Press: Urbana, 1972).

14. Any national study of problems in intercollegiate athletics must avoid one pitfall; that is, a preoccupation with major institutions and interstate rivalries. Another tier of less visible state colleges warrant scrutiny. Although problems resulting from their competition may be solved in part by state coordinating boards, their use of federal financial aid funds to attract athletes is cause for national concern. The president of a state association of financial aid officers asserted that misuse of federal funds, particularly work-study, was blatant. Superficial examinations by the legislative auditors and infrequent federal audits were cited as contributory factors, not to mention the predispositions of a few aid officers and the pressure exerted on them.

15. This has also been the practice at the University of Maine. Intercollegiate athletics do not seem to have aroused much public interest over the years in Maine. There has been some negative reaction to the new president's mention in his inaugural address of bolstering the athletic program. While there is discussion of a new athletic emphasis, there is concurrently a talk of reclassifying intercollegiate athletics as an auxiliary enterprise.

17. In a recent Carnegie sponsored publication, Michael Cohen and James March have shown the American college president's penchant for the business image. *Leadership and Ambiguity The American College Presidency* (McGraw-Hill: New York, 1974) pages 41-81.

18, The Auditor's study recommended a reduction in the number of intercollegiate sports, an increase in ticket prices, a reduction in the number of complimentary tickets, soliciation of more gifts and donations, and renting of athletic facilities.

19. Kenneth J. Philpot and John R. Mackall, "Judicial Review of Disputes Between Athletes and the National Collegiate Athletic Association." *Stanford Law Review*, Volume 24; May, 1972, pages 903-929.

20. See Appendix A.

# APPENDIX A

## Interview Questions for Intercollegiate Athletic Study

1. What is your general impression of the current status of intercollegiate athletics in your state? (If any problems, probe further.)

2. What is your usual source of information concerning athletics in your state colleges and universities? (newspapers, college officials, students, etc.)

3. Are intercollegiate athletics an instrument of state unity?

4. The WICHE Program Classification Structure includes categories for intramural and intercollegiate athletics. Do you know of any inter-institutional or inter-state exchange of information with respect to these categories? What type, if any, of cost studies have been done for publicly supported institutions using these categories? Who uses them? With what results? Do institutions make budget requests for these categories specifically?

5. If you receive requests for support for intercollegiate athletics, how do you evaluate those requests? Inter-institutionsl comparisons? Which ones?

6. What percentage of your capital outlay requests over the last five years (and ten years) has been for physical education-intercollegiate athletics facilities?

7. Often colleges solicit funds for intercollegiate athletics from alumni and other benefactors. Should these institutions be required to report this income to a state educational agency or the legislature?

8. What kind of turnover has there been on the coaching staff of your institution? Why?

9. Many coaches also teach. Physical education facilities are also used for intercollegiate athletics. How do you assign expenditures for each?

10. How do you account for athletic revenues and expenditures? Include in operating costs? Charges for operation and maintenance of physical plant? Assign general administration and overhead? Charges for debt service? Which, if any, funds revert to the state?

11. Have any detailed studies of charges or methods of operations of intercollegiate athletics been conducated in your state?

12. Have any studies of financial aid to athletes been conducted?

If so, with what results? (e.g. What percentage of Regents' scholarships go to athletes?)

13. What effect does a winning team have on appropriations from the state legislature?

14. "Faculty and students must accept extra-curricular activities, including intercollegiate athletics, as an integral part of the educational program." (President's Commission on Higher Education, 1947) . Do you agree or disagree? Why?

15. "It is assumed that the primary intent of intercollegiate athletics is to enhance the student's development." (Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education, 1970) Do you agree or disagree? Would you elaborate?

16. How does the legislature in your state express its concern for intercollegiate athletics? (if at all)

17. Has the statewide governing or coordinating board for higher education in your state adopted any policies relating to intercollegiate athletics?

## METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

Several complementary methods were used to collect information for this paper. A questionnaire was distributed to the legislative reference service in each state. Copies of all bills relating directly to intercollegiate athletics which had been introduced in the last decade were requested. Responses were supplemented by a search of the state codes and examination of the Legislative Digest published by the Education Commission of the states. Budgetary documents and cost studies produced by statewide governing and coordinating boards were analyzed in the library of the Center for Research and Development of Higher Education at the University of California, Berkeley. State legislators and staff of the state boards were interviewed by telephone.

A special note of gratitude is due Mary Del Cont (reference librarian for the West Virginia Legislature) for her kind forbearance and willing assistance. James Fairweather's celerity with the Stanford computer and Elaine Reece's transcription of my hieroglyphics were heroic.

APPENDIX D

# RACE,
# SPORT,
# AND
# ACADEME -

## REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE BLACK ATHLETE

Submitted as a
part of the inquiry
on the feasibility
of a national study
on intercollegiate
athletics by the
American Council
on Education

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Task Force Chairman
New York, New York

March, 1974

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Task Force on the Black Athlete reviewed dozens of studies and statements about the concerns of the Black athlete. As a result of these deliberations, the Task Force concluded that racism permeates every segment of college athletics. This finding was not altogether unexpected not only because of the publicity that has been given to the concerns of Black athletes, but also because of the depths to which racism has penetrated every phase of American society. The Task Force identified specific problems which should be investigated in any national study of intercollegiate athletics. In addition, they specified a variety of research strategies to collect data on these problems and to develop recommendations to alleviate them.

Specifically, the Task Force finds that there is considerable evidence, both of an informal and formal nature, which reflects discrimination and unequal treatment in athletics. Among these concerns are such things as: inadequate educational programs, lack of tutoring, failure of Black athletes to receive degrees in a similar proportion to their white counterparts, inequitable treatment concerning financial aid, summer jobs and jobs for wives, position stacking, playing quotas, social isolation, limitations on dress, political expression and dating practices, lack of Black coaches and Black officials, limited opportunities for Black women athletes, and concern for the breadth and scope of athletic programs in Black colleges.

Needless to say, such a listing of grievances and concerns points the way to the need for serious, in depth study to identify the factors that cause them and to develop approaches to eliminate discrimination in college athletics immediately. The Task Force feels that elimination of the basic problems of the Black athlete would do much to root out the cancer that is spreading throughout intercollegiate athletics.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|---|
| Introduction | 1 |
| Approach of the Task Force | 3 |
| I. Discrimination and the Black Athlete | 5 |
| II. Education and the Black Athlete | 7 |
| III. The Black Woman Athlete | 15 |
| IV. Black Coaches and Officials | 25 |
| V. The Black Colleges | 29 |
| VI. The Media and the Black Athlete | 30 |
| Summary of Cost of the Proposed Studies | 32 |
| Members of the Task Force on the Black Athlete | 33 |
| Appendix 1 - Excerpt from "Black Americans in Sports: Unequal Opportunity for Equal Ability" by Norman R. Yetman and D. Stanley Eitzen | 34 |
| Appendix 2 - "Some Methodological Concerns on the Study of Discrimination Against the Black Athlete" by John W. Loy | 40 |
| Appendix 3 - Suggested Survey Instrument on Study of Discrimination Against the Black Athlete" by Leon Coursey | 45 |
| Appendix 4 - "Black Athletes: Educational, Economic and Political Considerations" by Robert L. Green, et al. | 53 |
| Appendix 5 - "The 'Jock-Trap'--How the Black Athlete Gets Caught!" by Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. | 110 |

Page

Appendix 6 - Sample Questions for Survey on Black Officials by Melvin Evans 116

Interview Questions Concerning Black Coaches at Predominately White Institutions by Melvin Evans 118

Appendix 7 - Suggested Questionnaire for Survey of Athletics in the Black Colleges by C. D. Henry 119

Appendix 8 - "Race, Sport and the News Media" by Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. 122

# RACE, SPORT AND ACADEME -

# REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE BLACK ATHLETE

Race, sport and academe: how are they related, what are the problems, and what are the solutions?

> . . . . . "If I thought I would be burned /by another boycott/, I wouldn't recruit any more Black athletes"

> . . . . . "It is the worst possible kind of exploitation that Black athletes do not eventually obtain their degrees"

> . . . . . "Black youngsters pour their time and energy into sport; they're deluded and seduced by the athletic flesh market; used and discarded"

> . . . . . "Every morning the world of sport wakes up and congratulates itself on contributions to race relations. The litany has been repeated so many times that it is believed almost universally"

The above quotes merely serve to highlight the concerns of Black coaches and educators about the status of the Black athlete in today's world of sport, both college and professional. It was these concerns that the Task Force on the Black Athlete tried to uncover. These concerns must be viewed in the entire context of intercollegiate athletics in 1974. The Chronicle of Higher Education (September 24, 1974) highlighted them thusly: "An Unprecedented Economic and Ethical Crisis Grips Big Time Sports."

The magnitude of the situation in college athletics is reflected in the following statistics:

. . . . . During the 1972-73 football season, more than 400 million Americans witnessed 2,997 games played by 620 colleges.

. . . . . The games involved about 60,000 players, coaches and trainers.

. . . . . The total TV audience for the season was estimated at 350 million.

. . . . . In the 1972-73 college basketball season, for example, there were 32,318 games played by 1,243 colleges with an attendance of 25 million.

With these staggering statistics, it is easy to understand how increasing pressure is borne upon coach, athlete and college presidents alike. The Black athlete is pivotal in this crisis because he provides so much of the energy, the talent and the excitement that woos the millions of people into the stadiums and arenas of the nation.

As American society, cognizant of the depth of racism in it, has moved to alleviate some of the most striking inequities and indignities facing Black people, the Black athlete and his supporters from the Civil Rights Movement have intensified their fight on racism in sports. In protests, such as John Carlos' and Tommie Smith's raised fists at the 1968 Olympics, Black athletes have dramatized their anger over racism on the field, in the classroom and on the campus. They are demanding results, and the athletic establishment cannot afford to ignore their demands.

## APPROACH OF THE TASK FORCE

The Task Force on the Black Athlete was to examine various concerns and propose strategies for studying them. Membership of the Task Force was drawn from a spectrum of experiences, institutions and geographical locations and included the following people:

Dr. Leon Coursey
University of Maryland Eastern Shore -- Dr. Coursey is a young person in the profession and is Director of Athletics at his institution. He has also written on the subject of the Black athlete.

Dr. Melvin Evans
Jackson State College -- Dr. Evans has recently received his doctorate and has been active in various efforts to obtain equal opportunities for Blacks in physical education and sport.

Dr. Robert Green
Michigan State University -- Dr. Green was one of the organize of the activities in the Big Ten to obtain equal opportunities for Black athletes there. He is Dean of the College of Urban Development at Michigan State University.

Dr. Charles Henry
Grambling College -- Dr. Henry is a graduate of the University of Iowa and has had many years of experience in the interworkings of bringing the Black athlete into the mainstream of American athletics, particularly in the NAIA.

Dr. Nell Jackson
Michigan State University -- Dr. Jackson is a former women's Olympic coach and has been in the forefront of the efforts to obtain changes for both Black and white women athletes. She is Assistant Athletic Director for Women at Michigan State University.

Dr. John Loy
University of Massachusetts -- Dr. Loy has published several studies on the role of racial discrimination in sport and is a nationally known authority in sports sociology.

Dr. Roscoe C. Brown, Jr., Chairman
New York University -- Dr. Brown has written widely on the topic of the Black athlete and is an authority on higher education for Black youth. He is Director of the Institute of Afro-American Affairs.

The Task Force held two, day-long meetings, several telephone conferences and prepared several papers which identified issues of paramount importance to the Black athlete. They also identified those problem areas which seemed generic to all college athletes, i.e., problems in which considerations are similar for both white and Black athletes. The deliberations resulted in the identification of the following areas as areas for in-depth study:

I. Discrimination against the Black athlete

II. Education and the Black athlete

III. The Black woman athlete

IV. Black coaches and officials

V. The Black colleges

VI. The media and the Black athlete

In the following report, each of these areas will be discussed in terms of the problems or concerns in the area, possible research strategies to examine the problem, and an estimate of the approximate cost to carry out that phase of the study.

## I. Discrimination and the Black Athlete

The following concerns were identified by the Task Force as areas in which Black athletes feel that there is discrimination:

1. social isolation
2. stereotyping of Black athletes by white coaches and administrators
3. inferior housing for Black athletes
4. position stacking (Black athletes are often made to compete for the same position)
5. playing quotas (Black athletes are often limited in playing time in order to maintain a racial balance of the athletes on the field)
6. inability of Black athletes' wives to obtain jobs comparable to their educational training

7. individual grooming habits of Black athletes
8. dating habits of Black athletes
9. ineffective communication between Black athletes and their white coaches and other white athletic officials
10. intolerance of Black athletes' political and religious views by white coaches and white administrators
11. general institutional racism and its policy of benign neglect when it comes to Black students

In listing these problems, the Task Force does not propose that they are all of similar magnitude or that they occur at every institution, but it was the concensus of the group, that these issues are the ones most frequently voiced by Black athletes.

The following statement from a study on racial discrimination in college and professional basketball (see Appendix 1 for the conclusions of the study) by Norman Yetman and D. Stanley Eitzen aptly summarizes the views of critical observers of the current athletic scene:

> "whatever the factors operating, the conclusion that Black athletes encounter discrimination . . . . . seems inescapable. Despite the myth to the contrary, equality of opportunity for those of equal skills is not operating."

## Research Strategy

Despite general impressions about discrimination against Black athletes, systematic collection of data on these problems should help focus attention on them, thus establishing a basis for recommendations and action to alleviate them. In examining these concerns, it is important to provide more than a static survey of the state of affairs. Some effort should be devoted to attempt to obtain at least a partial insight into the causal mechanisms underlying these problems. Since longitudinal investigation is not practically feasible, it is suggested that a comparative analysis be made and that this comparison include the following factors:

1. race
2. degree level (freshman, senior)
3. type of sport
4. type of institution (size, region, form of control)

In order to accomplish this, it is recommended that a stratified sample of 25 institutions be selected. From each institution 50 athletes, 30 white and 20 Black, would be selected for the study. They would be interviewed and asked to complete an in-depth questionnaire. It is proposed that two graduate students be employed at each institution to conduct the collection of data. The analysis of the data would be conducted by central staff. The estimated cost of such a study will probably be around $25,000. (Some comments on research methodology and samples of possible interview questions are presented in Appendices 2 and 3.)

## II. Education and The Black Athlete

Probably the greatest specific grievance of the Black athlete is the fact that more times than not he does not get the degree for which he attends college. Several studies have shown that the graduation rate of Black athletes is significantly below that of white athletes. In general there is about a two to one ratio. Twice as many white athletes graduate as Black athletes. An analysis of athletes at one major mid-western university, for example, showed that 82% of white athletes graduated while only 46% of the Black athletes graduated. (The published graduation rate for the total male population at this university is 65%.) At a major Far Western university in a ten year period of twenty Black football players, only seven graduated. At another Western university of 46 Black athletes, only 12 eventually received degrees and so it goes at one major university after another.

One often-stated hypothesis to explain these horrifying statistics is that there is a low expectation of Black athletes' academic ability by coaches, instructors and student peers. The relationship between expectation and educational performance has been well documented in the general literature of educational psychology. In addition, the Black athlete enters the white university with a background from his high school that is usually inferior because of the inferior staffing and financing of the secondary schools which most Black athletes attend. Further, the Black athlete may feel that he does not belong on a predominately white campus. The point is driven home time and time again that he is there as a paid "gladiator" and that his role is to perform in accordance with the wishes and desires of the coaches to "bring home the bacon" on Saturday afternoon.

It is generally agreed that personal and educational counseling is the key to improving the sitation. Green and his colleagues in a recent monograph make the following recommendations about counseling athletes at predominately white universities:[1]

> "1. Black and white college and university counselors must join together forming a coalition of experts to present the case of the black student athlete to appropriate officials in the school administration and to the leadership of the athletic conference to which the school belongs. The legitimacy of the athletes' case can only be strengthened by a black-white coalition and will force white administrators and the white community at large to give greater credence to the facts presented with regard to the unique counseling needs of black athletes.
>
> 2. Academic counseling for all athletes should be removed from the athletic departments and placed in the hands of counselors whose major concern will be the educational needs of the student rather than his continued eligibility at any cost. There should be sufficient number of counselors to meet the requirements of all athletes. Minority counselors should be hired to work with all athletes, but they

---

[1] Green, Robert L., Thomas S. Gunnings, Joseph H. McMillan and Gloria S. Smith. "Black Athletes: Educational, Economic and Political Considerations." To be published as a monograph of the Journal of Non-White Concerns, a division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association.

should also speak to the financial and other immediate needs of minority athletes.

3. A personal counseling program for black athletes should be developed to help the black student on the white campus deal with the new social milieu in which he finds himself. A similar program for white athletes should also be instituted if there is an assessed need for such a program.

4. University counselors, both black and white, must form a pressure group pushing the university to employ greater numbers of black people in meaningful jobs at all levels within the athletic department. The employment of blacks in significant capacities can provide relevant role models which are important to the black athlete in his academic and personal development.

5. The recruiting program for athletes should be overhauled to give black students a realistic picture of the schools they choose to attend. Every prospective black recruit should be encouraged to consult with a school counselor during his visit to campus in order to discuss the educational and personal problems he may confront in the white campus community. Minority counselors should work with coaches involved in the recruitment process so that they will not make promises to athletes that violate conference regulations or which they cannot honor.

6. University counselors should begin a liaison program with high schools in those states supplying the greatest number of black athletes to the school. The purpose of this program would be to educate high school counselors on the real problems of black student athletes so that the student and his high school counselor can make realistic educational and career decisions at that stage.

7. The athletic governing board of every college and university should make provisions to include in its membership at least one faculty member in the field of minority counseling, either with vote or ex officio. The presence of a counseling expert will provide a new perspective on the council which must be taken into account as certain decisions affecting student athletes are deliberated."

Green, et al. present a detailed analysis of the educational concerns of the Black athlete in Appendix 4.

It is apparent from reading these recommendations that not only does the athletic establishment have much to do to help Black athletes earn degrees in the same proportion as the rest of the student body, but also the faculty, administrative and counseling staffs must reorder their priorities in order to become more effective with Black athletes. (Some comments by Brown on possible solutions to the educational dilemma of the Black athlete are presented in Appendix 5.)

## Research Strategy

The following research strategy is recommended to obtain up-to-date data on the comparative educational progress of Black and white athletes.

All institutions in the major athletic conferences will be asked to respond to a questionnaire on the rate of credits earned, GPA's, and graduation rate of Black and white athletes. Three kinds of institutions should be identified:

1. Those in which both Black and white athletes are achieving satisfactory academic success;
2. Those in which both Black and white athletes are not making satisfactory academic progress;
3. Those universities in which white athletes achieve satisfactorily but Black athletes do not. (Satisfactory academic success would be defined as rate of credits earned, GPA and graduation rate.)

After identifying the three kinds of universities, in-depth studies of the formal and informal support services and academic climates would be conducted at five institutions in each category. The purpose of this investigation would be to document how the three kinds of universities differ and to identify those factors that appear to be related to the academic success of Black athletes. The basic questions to be answered are:

1. Do the academic success and graduation rates of Black athletes differ in different sports?
2. What factors distinguish colleges and universities that have high rates of academic success and graduation rates for both Black and white athletes?
3. What factors distinguish colleges and universities that have high rates of academic success and graduation rates for white athletes but low rates for Black athletes?
4. What factors distinguish colleges and universities that have low rates of academic success and graduation rates for both Black and white athletes?

Data Needed

1. The numbers of Black and white athletes (perhaps operationally defined as those offered an athletic scholarship) admitted to each university in the sample since Fall, 1960.
2. The entrance test scores, high school averages,

and college academic records of every athlete since 1960.

3. Descriptions of the support services (formal and informal) provided to both Black and white athletes at each university including counseling (academic, personal and career), tutorial services, and financial support.
4. Descriptions of the university climate as it affects both Black and white athletes including expectations of the coaching staff, counselors, faculty and students.

The data could be provided by the registrar's office of each of the institutions once the athletes to be included in the study are identified. Graduate assistants operating under the direction of a central staff consultant would collect the data on each campus. The data would be coded to preserve the annonymity of both the institution and the individuals. The analysis would be conducted by the central staff or by a specialist hired by the central staff. Assuming that this study was conducted at fifteen institutions, it is estimated that this study could be done at a cost of approximately $25,000.

## III. The Black Woman Athlete

Concerns of the Black woman athlete parallel the concerns of the Black male athlete. In addition, however, the concerns of the Black woman athlete also parallel the concerns of white woman athletes, particularly in view of the fact that woman's athletics in colleges have generally been very limited. Recently, however, attempts to implement Title IX of the Educational Amendment Act of 1972 regarding discrimination in womens' athletics have created nationwide attention.

The traditional stereotyped female role in athletics is presently undergoing a dramatic change. Perhaps, the most significant development in girls' and womens' sports in recent years has been the growing interest in expanding programs for interscholastic and intercollegiate competitive sports. Competitive opportunities between 1920 and 1960 were limited mainly to intramurals, playdays and sportsdays. The highly skilled girls were largely ignored. These girls had to seek their competitive opportunities through such organizations as the AAU and USBVA. Today, the picture has changed drastically and women physical educators speak enthusiastically about the values to be gained from participation in properly conducted competitive sports programs. However, despite the development of additional athletic programs for girls and women, the number of Black participants has been noticeably few.

An examination of some of the problems surrounding the participation of the Black female athlete are presented below, first at Black colleges and then at predominately white institutions.

## In Black Colleges

### 1. Financial Support

In most instances, financial support for a competitive program is very limited. It ranges from no support, therefore no program, in some schools to some support in others. In schools where there are no programs, administrators and/or teachers have indicated the following reasons for the lack of programs: (1) insufficient interest among the girls; (2) lack of qualified women to coach; (3) belief that the needs of the students are met through other programs such as intramurals and (4) lack of funds available for women's programs.

The colleges that support a competitive program for the girls range from $500.00 to approximately $5,000.00 in financial support. A few of the schools in the south and southwest offer athletic scholarships to female student athletes. The number of scholarships tend to vary with each school, however, the majority of the schools offering athletic scholarships have concentrated on offering them in track and field. The scholarships vary in number with each school, some have as few as five while others number up to approximately ten.

2. Teacher and Coach Qualifications

A large percentage of the women physical education teachers do not have the background to coach competitive teams. As a result, the number of schools presenting competitive opportunities to their female students is rather limited. Many of those offering a program have male coaches. This is especially true in track and field. Most of the women who are coaching have a background in competitive sports and compete in sports at one stage of their undergraduate education.

3. Sports Most Frequently Offered

   The following sports are found most often in the program: basketball, volleyball and track and field. A few schools indicated they have competition in tennis.

4. Access to Facilities

   Some Black schools indicated that they have adequate access to facilities for practice and competition while others indicated they do not have desirable practice times. The question of access to facilities tends to be more of a problem with the use of the gym instead of outdoor facilities such as the track.

### Summary

The competitive sport program for women in Black colleges is in its formative stages. Many schools had active programs in some sports in the 40's and 50's, but the programs were de-emphasized or dropped during the 60's. Now, having gone full circle, there is an interest in reviving many of the inactive programs.

Few of the programs currently in operation are adequately funded. The crux of the problem for a large percentage of the Black colleges seems to lie in the following areas:

1. Lack of administrative support for a bonafide competitive program where interest exists.
2. Lack of adequate financial support for a bonafide program where interest exists.
3. Too few women physical educators willing to retool themselves in technique of coaching skills in schools where there is an interest among the students.
4. Too many female students who enter college with poor physical skills; therefore, the teachers have to spend an unnecessary amount of time developing basic skill patterns necessary for learning certain sports.

### In White Colleges

The number of Black women competing on competitive sport teams in basically white colleges is relatively limited. The best estimate Dr. Nell Jackson, a Task Force member, could provide is approximately six percent. Colleges within the metropolitan areas tend to have a slightly higher ratio of Blacks on such teams as basketball and track and field.

The sports most frequently offered in the program are: basketball, golf, gymnastics, field hockey, softball, swimming and diving, tennis, track and field and volleyball.

1. Financial Support

   Funds spent on women intercollegiate sports programs vary from $1,000 to $85,000. The larger budgets include funds for salaries of coaches and athletic directors. Perhaps it would be more realistic to indicate operational budgets ranging up to $54,000.

2. Teacher and Coach Qualifications

   The percentage of Black women physical education teachers in white schools is relatively small. Many physical education administrators indicate that they cannot find a "qualified" Black woman to fill vacancies. Their search for a person involves asking their fellow administrators and friends for a recommendation. As a result of these kinds of hiring practices, there are few

Black females coaching collegiate sports.

Black female graduate students also have problems in completing their work. In some schools the Black students are told they must make up certain course deficiences while white students with the same deficiencies are not required to do this.

3. Role Modeling

The lack of an adequate number of Black female women in the teaching and coaching fields leaves a void for many of the Black female students in "role models." The visibility of Black women successfully performing professional jobs could have a positive influence on the career aspirations of the students. However, if the students cannot find these women, then many students will assume there are no opportunities available for them at that level.

4. Stereotyping in Sports

Some of the white coaches tend to associate Black athletes with certain sports - mostly track and field and basketball. However, today, more Blacks are coming from schools with strong physical education and athletic programs. We are beginning to see more Black women coming to college with a better than average background in tennis, volleyball, gymnastics, tumbling and fencing. However, when a Black woman is cut from one of the latter sports she is often told (suggested) that she should try-out for the track or basketball team regardless of her interest.

5. Selection (Team)

Generally, the team members are selected for teams based on their abilities as defined by the coach. However, some Black women experience a capricious form of selection by their coaches. Listed below are some examples of capricious selection:

1. In basketball, a girl was told she was too fast (swift) for the squad;
2. Girls are being stacked into positions;

3. Underestimating abilities in some sports, rating their skills below that of their teammates when peers know better;
4. Putting them in certain positions during try-outs where they will have to learn new movements;
5. Using a quota system; and
6. Requiring more from the Blacks than other students.

Interestingly, some teachers and coaches are not aware of the capriciousness used in selecting and conducting their teams. On the other hand, some are quite aware of the entire process.

Summary

The problems associated with Black women in competitive intercollegiate sports in predominately white colleges tend to fall in the following categories:

1. Teachers and coaches. The administrators are still playing the same old game of not being able to find "qualified" Black women for the positions in spite of the affirmative action

plans that are suppose to be in operation.

2. Teachers and coaches need to be made aware of their conscious and unconscious techniques used to select their teams.
3. Teachers and coaches need to be made aware of the stereotyping used with the Black athletes.
4. Since women, in general, are becoming more involved in competitive athletics, they must realize that the program is not another form of intramurals or sportsdays and requires a great deal more understanding, planning, cooperation and commitment than previously.

Research Strategy

The following areas for research on the problems of the women athlete are listed below:

1. The Black Colleges
    a. administrative support
    b. financial support of the women's intercollegiate programs
    c. qualifications of female coaches
    d. access to facilities
    e. sports offered
    f. number of participants

2. The White Colleges
    - a. financial support
    - b. sports offered
    - c. percentage of Black athletes in program
    - d. sports in which Blacks participate
    - e. problem of stereotyping
    - f. qualification of coaches
        - (1) percentage of Black coaches
        - (2) qualification of Black coaches
    - g. need for Black role modeling
    - h. team selection - capricious forms of selection

Again, a sampling procedure should be used. In this instance sampling both Black and white colleges. It is recommended that 20 Black institutions and 20 major white institutions be surveyed. It is recommended that a questionnaire be used as a major means of data collection with follow-up with selected administrators and coaches using structured interviews. The cost of this phase of the study should not exceed $5,000.

## IV. Black Coaches and Officials

The Black coaches at predominately white schools might well be the most proficient tight rope walkers who have ever performed on the high wire. Cursory observations indicate that Black coaches are exploited in many ways similar to Black athletes. There have been situations where Black high school coaches were given assistant coaching positions in order to influence some blue-chip athletes to attend that school. If the Black athlete does not live up to expectations, the Black coach is transferred to some other part of the university as a dormitory counselor. In some instances things are made so disquieting that they must leave the university or pay their own way by means other than support from the athletic department.

In some situations where the Black athlete lives up to expectations, the Black coach enjoys the title of assistant coach and little else. Generally, Black assistants are given no field assignments and have little or no authority in the organization. The head coach expects him to keep the Black athlete "happy," do the biddings of other assistant coaches, and be seen and not heard.

The few Black assistant coaches who have asserted themselves have not remained in their positions long.

Generally, these coaches finish their doctorate degrees and move on to less demanding positions where they can exercise their rights and privileges as professional coaches.

One of the questions that has bothered Black athletic personnel for years is why are there so few Black officials involved in athletics? It would appear that since there are so many Black participants, there should be better representation of Blacks in the area of officiating. When one thinks of the competencies required to be an official, one would have to be puzzled at the paucity of Black athletic officials in this country. In most recent years Black athletes have dominated collegiate and professional basketball in most parts of the country. It is quite infrequent that one sees less than seven of the starters of any two teams who are not Black. It is just as infrequent that one sees a Black official in these contests. This latter fact can probably be attributed to overt and subtle racism that has plagued sports in this country for years. The theory that Blacks should be controlled permeates the entire sports structure. Rarely, if ever, does any part of the structure permit Blacks to be in control.

## Research Strategy

Data about Black officials and Black coaches could be collected by means of a questionnaire survey. The study of Black officials would involve each of the major conferences recognized by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Each conference commissioner would be sent a questionnaire designed to solicit answers to the questions raised relative to Black officials. Among these questions are:

1. the number of Black officials;
2. how Black officials are assigned (are they assigned only to certain games or certain areas);
3. what assignments they are given on the field;
4. what kind of attempts are made to recruit Black officials?

The survey of the status of the Black coach would be based on a questionnaire sent to a sample of 25 institutions in the major athletic conferences to determine the number of Black coaches and the types of assignments they are given. (See Appendix 6 for sample questions concerning the Black coach and the Black official.)

In addition to sending questionnaires to athletic directors of these institutions, questionnaires will be sent to the Black student union, if one exists, on each campus to obtain the views of Black students on the same topics. If there is no Black student organization on campus, an attempt will be made to send questionnaires to Black faculty members or Black student athletes.

In order to get answers to some questions, interviews will be necessary. A graduate student at each institution or group of institutions would be employed to give the interview. A central staff consultant would coordinate the efforts of the graduate students and would be responsible for analysis of the data obtained from the questionnaires and interviews for both studies. The cost for these studies would be approximately $7,000.

## V. The Black Colleges

The focus of the study of the Black athlete and the Black colleges would be to determine whether there are certain factors operating in the Black colleges which may be deleterious to the Black athlete and the Black coach. It is well known that the Black colleges are now suffering in their competition with their white counterparts for student-athletes. This is particularly true in the southern part of the country. Some institutions which were predominately white now have special admissions programs for Black students which make it possible for white institutions to enroll outstanding athletes who have weak academic backgrounds, and thus not be admissible to Black colleges. Since these athletes are in a special program and are considered eligible to compete on varsity teams, the Black colleges are placed at a disadvantage.

Research Strategy

In order to obtain data on these and other factors such as educational progress, counseling, and financial aid at Black colleges, a questionnaire should be sent to all of the Black institutions in the major Black conferences. The study would be coordinated by a central staff consultant person employed for the purpose and probably could be completed for approximately $5,000. (See Appendix 7 for suggested questions on questionnaire.)

## VI. The Media and the Black Athlete

The media, particularly, the electronic media, but also the weekly and monthly sports magazines, have great influence on the image and stereotypes presented to the public of both white and Black athletes. In view of the fact that championship events may be seen by as many as 30 to 50 million people, study of the media is a significant area of investigation when one attempts to weigh the impact of various factors which impinge upon the status and role of the college athlete. Black athletes, in particular, often are faced with either biased reporting or reporting that tends to emphasize certain negative features of Black athletes or their positions. In addition, the media presents a sugarcoated portrayal of the situation of the Black athlete, thus create false images of "Shangri-La" for Black youth. The situation in the media is exacerbated by the fact that there are relatively few Blacks employed in the sports media. In particular, there are no play-by-play Black announcers on major television networks or stations in either football or basketball or feature sports writers on the major dailies. (Some comments by Brown on the media and the Black athlete are presented in Appendix 8.)

## Research Strategy

It is proposed that the study of the media and the Black athlete, as well as his white counterpart, involve two phases. First, a content analysis of newspapers, sports magazines, selected radio and TV programs covering both the Black press and the white press should be done to examine themes and trends in sports reporting concerning Blacks. Second, media executives should be surveyed by questionnaire to determine the extent of employment of Black media personnel as well as the policy of the media on sports coverage. In addition, selected media executives would be interviewed on the same issue. A media expert should be employed to conduct this phase of the sports study. The study would probably cost about $10,000.

## SUMMARY OF COSTS[1]

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| I. | Discrimination and the Black Athlete | $25,000. |
| II. | Education and the Black Athlete | 25,000. |
| III. | The Black Woman Athlete | 5,000. |
| IV. | Black Coaches and Officials | 7,000. |
| V. | The Black Colleges | 5,000. |
| VI. | The Media and the Black Athlete | 10,000. |
| | Total | $77,000. |

---

[1] These costs do not include central staff personnel who would be responsible for coordination of the overall study on the Black athlete.

## MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE ON THE BLACK ATHLETE

| | Principal Area of Responsibility |
|---|---|
| Dr. Leon Coursey<br>Head of Physical Education and Director of Athletics<br>University of Maryland Eastern Shore (Maryland State) | Discrimination and the Black Athlete |
| Dr. Melvin Evans<br>Chairman of Physical Education<br>Jackson State College | Black Coaches and Officials |
| Dr. Robert Green<br>Dean<br>College of Urban Development<br>Michigan State University | Education and the Black Athlete |
| Dr. Charles Henry<br>Professor and Head of Health, Physical Education and Recreation<br>Grambling College | The Black Colleges |
| Dr. Nell Jackson<br>Assistant Director of Athletics for Women<br>Michigan State University | The Black Woman Athlete |
| Dr. John Loy<br>Professor of Sociology and Physical Education<br>University of Massachusetts | Discrimination and the Black Athlete |
| Dr. Roscoe C. Brown, Jr. (Chairman)<br>Director<br>Institute of Afro-American Affairs<br>Professor of Education<br>New York University | Chairman of the Task Force<br>The Media and the Black Athlete<br>Preparation of Final Report |

Excerpted from:

## BLACK AMERICANS IN SPORTS: UNEQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR EQUAL ABILITY[1]

"Conclusion

Although the patterns are not so strong among pro as among college teams, these data have consistently shown that black players in organized collegiate and professional basketball have been found disproportionately in starting roles. Several possible explanations for this phenomenon have been advanced. First, it has been suggested that blacks are naturally better athletes and their predominance in starting roles can be attributed to their innate athletic superiority. As sociologists, we are inclined to reject interpretations of black athletic superiority as genetically or physiologically based, although our stance must be an agnostic one, since there is too little evidence on the question. What is important to note here, however, is that although a genetic interpretation is a logical (if not entirely convincing) explanation of the disproportionate percentage of blacks found on college and pro teams, it cannot explain their prevalence in starting roles. Even if blacks possessed genetically based athletic superiority, they should not be systematically overrepresented in starting positions, but should still be randomly distributed throughout the entire team. As Jim Bouton, a former major league baseball player who has challenged the racial composition of major league baseball teams, has written, 'If 19 of the top hitters are black, then almost two-thirds of all hitters should be black. Obviously it is not that way.'* An Interpretation based on the natural superiority of blacks must, therefore, be rejected.

A second possible explanation is discrimination in recruiting practices. Harry Edwards has charged that college coaches, in their recruitment of blacks, seek to obtain only those players who are almost certain to be starters.

---

[1] Yetman, Norman R. and D. Stanley Eitzen. "Black Americans in Sports: Unequal Opportunity for Equal Ability." Civil Rights Digest, 5:2, August 1972.

*Jim Bouton, Ball Four (New York: World Publishing Company, 1970), p. 302

> A black athlete generally fares well in athletic competition relative to other incoming athletes at a white-dominated college. The cards are somewhat stacked for him, however, because few black high school athletes get what are typically classified as second-and-third string athletic grants-in-aid. One simply does not find black athletes on 'full-rides' at predominately white schools riding the bench or playing second-or-third team positions. Second-and-third team athletic grants-in-aid are generally reserved for white athletes.*

This appears to be a plausible explanation of the data for both college and professional players. On the one hand, the coach may be consciously or unconsciously prejudiced and may find the idea of having black team members repugnant, but nonetheless he may recruit black 'star' players because their presence will enhance his team's performance. In this situation the black player who is capable, but not outstanding, is liable to be overlooked, while his white counterpart is not. In addition, coaches are sensitive to criticism of their coaching policies by powerful alumni, booster organizations, and fans. In a situation where these groups are perceived by a white coach as bigoted, even if he himself is not, it is likely that his recruitment of black players will be calculated to minimize criticism of his coaching policies. Therefore, black team members are more likely to be outstanding athletes, for the performance of average ballplayers would be inadequate to counterbalance the criticism their presence would create. For many years a 'quota' system, limiting the number of black starters, operated informally in both college and professional basketball.*

---

*Harry Edwards, The Revolt of the Black Athlete (New York: The Free Press, 1969).

The selective recruitment of only those blacks certain to be starters may be undertaken consciously or unconsciously, but it would appear seldom to be acknowledged by a coach. However, one the Nation's most highly successful college coaches, one who has been acclaimed as a recruiter adept at communicating with young black ballplayers, has advanced a sophisticated rationale for the reason three of the four blacks on his 1970-71 squad were starters. 'The ghetto environment of the black demands that he be a star, if he is to participate at all,' he explained. 'He could never justify an understudy's role to himself or to the brothers he left behind in the playground. Thus there is no point recruiting blacks who will not start.'** Whether this impressionistic theory of black sport role socialization is valid or merely a justification for selective recruitment must be more fully assessed.

Another explanation that has been advanced to explain the disproportionate number of black starters is that of structural inequalities--especially educational and economic--that are found in the larger society and have disproportionate effects on black, as contrasted to white, athletes. Thus, athletic ability, talent, and associated skills are not the only criteria by which a potential college athlete is selected. Academic ability is also a crucial factor to be weighed in the decision of whether or not to award an athletic scholarship. One of the major problems in the recruitment of an athlete to compete for a college or university is that he may be academically unqualified for the academic demands that a college athlete must face. Since the quality of elementary and secondary education received by blacks has been demonstrated to be inferior,*** a greater percentage of potential black athletes would tend to be marginal students.

Moreover, most universities reflect a white middle class cultural bias that represents a substantial hindrance to students from backgrounds other than white and middle class. Thus, while a coach may offer a scholarship to an outstanding player who is a marginal student or to a marginal player who is an outstanding student, he will most likely hesitate to offer a scholarship to a marginal player who is also a marginal student. These factors are important ones for the college coach to weigh, and, although racial factors may not enter into these calculations directly, the effects of these kinds of policies will be felt disproportionately by blacks.

---

*William F. Russell "Success is a Journey", Sports Illustrated (June 8, 1970), pp. 81-93.

**Quoted by Robert Lipsyte in the New York Times (March 1, 1971), p. 37.

***James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1966).

This appears to be a plausible interpretation of the data and, indeed, there are undoubtedly situations in which these kinds of considerations have operated. Fortunately we possessed some data that enabled us to test how significant a factor this may have been in explaining our earlier findings. As part of our original request of sports information directors, we requested information on the grade-point averages (GPA's) of the players. We received information on all members of 110 integrated teams. If the argument that academic potential is a significant variable influencing the relative recruitment of marginal black players is valid, then one would conclude that the GPA's of second-string black players would be higher than those of first-string blacks, for whom the academic considerations would be a less crucial factor.

We found that the average GPA's of the 106 starting blacks in our sample was 2.26 (on a 4-point scale), whereas the average of 98 second-string players was 2.33. Although this slight difference is in the predicted direction, it did not even approach statistical significance. Thus, although these considerations may have been operative in specific cases, they must be dismissed as factors in substantially influencing the distribution of the data.

The limited access of blacks to institutions of higher learning may also be instrumental in contributing to the patterns described above in another way. Each competing educational institution has only a limited number of athletic scholarships to dispense each year and these are awarded to outstanding players. However, often a squad will have players from the student body--'walk-ons'--who have not been recruited by the coach but who 'try out' for the squad and make it. Because blacks comprise an extremely small proportion of the student bodies at predominately white institutions, most such non-scholarship athletes will be white. Thus, a team may be composed of several outstanding black and white players on scholarship and several mediocre players who are white.

A final explanation of the disproportionate black prowess in both college and professional basketball resides in the structural limitations to which black children and adults are subjected. Since opportunities for vertical mobility by blacks in American society are circumscribed, athletics may become perceived as one of the few means by which a black can succeed in a highly competitive American society; a male black child's and adolescent's primary role models are much more likely than a white's to be athletic heroes.* And the determination and motivation devoted to the pursuit of an athletic career may therefore be more intense than for the white adolescent whose career options are greater. Jack Olsen, in his The Black Athlete, quotes a prominent black coach:

> People keep reminding me that there is a difference in physical ability between the races, but I think there isn't. The Negro boy practices longer and harder. The Negro has the keener desire to excel in sports because it is more mandatory for his future opportunities than it is for a white boy. There are nine thousand different jobs available to a person if he is white.

On the other hand, James Green of the University of Wisconsin, Green Bay, has questioned whether the lure of a professional career completely explains the strong emphasis on athletics among blacks. He argues that the explanation that blacks manifest a 'keener desire to excel ... because it is mandatory for his future...' simply reflects the commentator's own future orientation. An alternative explanation of strong black motivation, according to Green, is the positive emphasis in black subculture that is placed on the importance of physical (and verbal) skill and dexterity. Athletic prowess in men is highly valued by both women and other men. The athletically capable male is in the comparable position of the hustler or the blues singer; he is something of a folk hero. He achieves a level of status and recognition among his peers whether he is a publicly applauded sports hero or not.

---

*The prominence of sports stars among role models of black adolescents has been suggested by Joseph Himes, "Negro Teen-Age Culture", Annals, 1961.

Whatever the factors operating, the conclusion that black athletes encounter discrimination in collegiate and professional basketball seems inescapable. Despite the myth to the contrary, equality of opportunity for those of equal skills is not operating. This conclusion has implications that extend beyond the sports world. If discrimination occurs in so public an arena, one so generally acknowledged to be discrimination free, and one where a premium is placed on individual achievement rather than upon ascription, how much more subtly pervasive must discrimination be in other areas of American life, where personal interaction is crucial and where the actions of power wielders are not subjected to public scrutiny."

# SOME METHODOLOGICAL CONCERNS ON THE STUDY OF DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE BLACK ATHLETE

John W. Loy

## Introduction

Professor Coursey and I have been asked to address ourselves to the topic of "The Social Roles of the Black Athlete and Informal Support Systems." As Dr. Coursey has well delineated the substantive concerns related to the role of the black athlete, I shall largely emphasize the methodological issues associated with our topic.

I believe that the major methodological problem of the proposed project is that of developing a research design which will provide more than a "static descriptive survey" of the current state of affairs viz.-a-viz. sport and higher education with special reference to the black athlete. Thus, notwithstanding the imporance of adequately describing the parameters of present problems, I contend that efforts should be made to obtain at least partial insight into the casual mechanisms underlying these problems. Moreover, although a longitudinal investigation is not practically feasible, I suggest that cross-sectional data should be utilized in such a manner so as to offer some estimates of personal and social change. In short, I argue that a comparative perspective on matters is mandatory.

## Sampling

For purposes of comparative analysis sampling procedures should control for:

1. Race (black, white, other)
2. Sex (female, male)
3. Age (freshmen, seniors)
4. Level of Sport Involvement (varsity, intramural, recreational)
5. Type of Institution (size, region, form of control, etc.)

Many other factors could be considered but these five seem a must for any sampling frame constructed for the project.

## Research Outline

With respect to the social roles and educational experiences of the black athlete a 'before, during and after' paradigm is in order for comparative purposes. A suggested model is:

I. Pre-College Characteristics of Students
  A. Personal Background - abilities, attitudes, attributes
  B. Social Background - family, friends, community
  C. Academic Background - interests, achievements, aspirations
  D. Athletic Background - interests, achievements, aspirations
  E. Other Activities - interests, achievements, aspirations
II. College Characteristics and Student Perceptions of Campus Environment
  A. Organizational Characteristics
  B. Environmental Press and Individual Needs
  C. Student Subcultures
  D. Faculty Subcultures
  E. Racial Integration
III. Student Transition and Adjustment
  A. Effects of an Adaptation to "Subcultural Shock"
  B. Academic Problems and Coping Strategies
  C. Athletic Problems and Coping Strategies

- D. Social Problems and Coping Strategies
- E. Formal versus Informal Educational Experiences

IV. The Impact of Institutions upon Individuals

- A. Basic Skills
- B. Personality Traits
- C. Attitudes
- D. Values
- E. Occupational Choice and Career Plans

V. The Impact of Individuals upon Institutions

- A. Administrative (e.g., hiring administrators to represent minorities)
- B. Academic (e.g., establishing black studies programs)
- C. Athletic (e.g., hiring black coaches)
- D. Residential (e.g., modification of student housing patterns)
- E. Social Relations (student life-styles, dating behavior, etc.)

VI. Post-College Consequences for Students

- A. Educational Mobility
- B. Geographical Mobility

C. Occupational Mobility

D. Community Involvement

E. Social Orientations

Note: Professor Loy goes on to review certain observations from the literature on these concerns. He also presents a bibliography which might be of value to investigators studying these topics and is appended on the next three pages.

## Bibliography

1. Barton, Allen H. Organizational Measurement and Its Bearing on the Study of College Environments. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

2. Bereiter, Carl and Mervin B. Freedman. "Fields of Study and the People in Them," Chapter 17, pp. 563-596 IN Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

3. Blau, Peter M. The Organization of Academic Work. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1973.

4. Brooks, Glenwood C. Jr. and William E. Sedlacek. "An Experimental Study of Differential Reactions of Whites Toward Negroes and Blacks," Proceedings of the 78th Annual American Psychological Association Convention, (1970) pp. 359-360.

5. Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Culture," pp. 39-54 IN T. F. Lunsford (ed.), The Study of Campus Cultures. Boulder, Colo.: Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, 1963.

6. Clark, Burton R. The Distinctive College: Antioch, Reed, & Swarthmore. Chicago: Aldine, 1970.

7. Cunningham, Gary A. "A Comparison of Activities and Interests of UCLA Male Athletes and Nonathletes" (Ed.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1970).

8. Feldman, Kenneth A. and Theodore M. Newcomb. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

9. Gaipa, John J. "Stereotypes and Perceived Ethnic Role Specializations," Journal of Social Psychology (1971) 85:285-292.

10. Gilbert, G. M. "Stereotype Persistence and Change Among College Students," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology (1951) 46: 245-254.

11. Haberman, Martin. Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, May 1972.

12. Jacob, Philip E. Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of Impact of College Teaching. New York: Harper and Row, 1957.

13. Newcomb, Theodore M. "Student Peer-Group Influence," Chapter 13, pp. 469-488 IN Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

14. Nunnally, Jim and others. "Factored Scales for Measuring Characteristics of College Environments," Educational and Psychological Measurement (1963) 23: 239-248.

15. Ostrom, T. M. and H. S. Upshaw. "Race Differences in the Judgment of Attitude Statements Over a Thirty-Five Year Period," Journal of Personality (1970) 38: 235-248.

16. Pace, C. Robert and George G. Stern. "An Approach to the Measurement of Psychological Characteristics of College Environments," Journal of Educational Psychology (1958) 49:269-277.

17. Pace, C. Robert. "Five College Environments," College Entrance Examination Board Review (1960) 41:24-28.

18. Pace, C. Robert. "Methods of Describing College Cultures," Teachers College Record (Jan. 1962) 63: 267-277.

19. Pace, C. Robert. CUES: College and University Environment Scales. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

20. Pace, C. Robert. "Perspectives on the Student and His College," pp. 76-100 IN Lawrence E. Dennis and Joseph F. Kauffman (eds.), The College and the Student. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

21. Ramsey, Robert R. "A Subcultural Approach to Academic Behavior," Journal of Educational Sociology (1962) 36: 3-24.

22. Sanford, Nevitt (ed.). The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

23. Sedlacek, William E. and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. "Social Acceptability in the Measurement of Racial Attitudes," Psychological Reports (1971) 29: 17-18.

24. Sedlacek, William E. and Glenwood C. Brooks, Jr. "Race of Experimenter in Racial Attitude Measurement," Psychological Reports (1972) 30: 771-774.

25. Stern, George C. "Environments for Learning," Chapter 21, pp. 690-730 IN Nevitt Sanford (ed.), The American College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1962.

26. Warren, J. B. "Student Perceptions of College Subcultures," American Educational Research Journal (Mar. 1968) 5 (2): 213-232.

27. Wiseman, H. V. Political Systems. New York: Praeger, 1966.

28. Yamamoto, Kaoru (ed.). The College Student and His Culture: An Analysis. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

## Appendix 3
## Suggested Survey Instrument on Study
## Discrimination Against the Black Athlete
## Leon Coursey

### PROPOSED SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1. Age ______

2. Varsity sport/sports __________, __________, __________

3. College ______________________________

4. Scholastic average ______________

5. Marital Status:

   a. Single ___

   b. Married ___

   c. Divorced ___

   d. Engaged ___

6. Sex:

   a. Female ___

   b. Male ___

7. Number of academic credits carrying this semester _____

8. I feel discriminated against while participating in intercollegiate athletics because I am:

   a. White ___

   b. Yellow ___

   c. Black ___

   d. Other ___

9. My social life on campus is:

   a. Enjoyable ___

   b. Miserable ___

   c. Tolerable ___

   d. Other ___

10. My place of religious workship is:

    a. Church ___

    b. Mosque ___

    c. Synagogue ___

    d. Other ___

11. My parent's average annual income is approximately:

    a. Below the national average ___

    b. National average ___

    c. Above the national average ___

    d. Other ___

12. The frequency in which I attend campus social functions may be characterized as:

    a. Frequent ___

    b. Infrequent ___

    c. Never ___

    d. Other ___

13. I eat pork ___; I do not eat pork ___.

14. I believe that blacks working within the system are selling out. ___ Yes ___ No

15. My academic major is ____________________.

16. Indicate the sport/sports in which you participate in:

    ____________________

    ____________________

    ____________________

17. I have ______ brothers and ______ sisters.

18. I have ______ sons and ______ daughters.

19. I am economically responsible for ______ people.

20. My father is employed as a:
    a. Factory worker ___
    b. Office worker ___
    c. Self-employed worker ___
    d. Other ___

21. My mother is a:
    a. Factory worker ___
    b. Office worker ___
    c. Domestic worker ___
    d. Other ___

22. I prefer to date:
    a. Blond coed ___
    b. Sisters ___
    c. Light skin sisters ___
    d. Others ___

23. I do not experience any problems when I go on a social date.
    ___ Yes ___ No

24. I plan to graduate from college in:
    a. 3-1/2 years ___
    b. 4 years ___
    c. 4-1/2 years ___
    d. Other ___

25. After undergraduate school, I plan to:
    a. Attend graduate school ___
    b. Work ___
    c. Play professional ball ___
    d. Others ___

26. Our school has black coaches and other black supporting athletic personnel. ___ Yes ___ No

27. Our college has the following black athletic personnel:

    a. Head Coach ___

    b. Trainer ___

    c. Assistant Coach ___

    d. Other ___

28. My undergraduate academic major was selected by:

    a. Me ___

    b. Head Coach ___

    c. Tutor ___

    d. Unknown ___

29. My registration is completed by:

    a. Me ___

    b. Head Coach ___

    c. Tutor ___

    d. Unknown ___

30. I strongly feel that our college has a need for:

    a. More black coaches ___

    b. More white coaches ___

    c. More black supporting personnel ___

    d. More white supporting personnel ___

31. I enjoy playing against the team that we are scheduled to compete against. ___ Yes ___ No

32. Are black student-athletes needed in only specific positions on your team? ___ Yes ___ No

33. The number of blacks on my team who are not starting is:

    a. I ___

b. 2 ___

c. 3 ___

d. 5 and over ___

34. Do you believe that your coaches operate your team under a playing quota for blacks policy? ___ Yes ___ No

35. I carry a pick:

a. Sometimes ___

b. Never ___

c. Yes ___

d. Other ___

36. The positions on our team where blacks are specifically played are:

a. Quarterback ___

b. Pitcher ___

c. Defensive back ___

d. Other ___

37. I wear mod clothes such as:

a. High heel shoes ___

b. Wide brimmed hats ___

c. Bright colored clothes ___

d. None of the above ___

38. My coaches wear clothes such as:

a. High heel shoes ___

b. Wide brimmed hats ___

c. Bright colored clothes ___

d. None of the above ___

39. I feel that I can confide in my coach in reference to personnal matters. ___ Yes ___ No

40. My coaches wear:

a. Long side burns ___

b. Goatèe ___

c. Afro ___

d. None of these ___

41. I wear:

a. Goatee ___

b. Afro ___

c. Long side burns ___

d. All of these ___

e. None of these ___

42. I feel more at ease socializing with:

a. Black people ___

b. White people ___

c. Any people ___

d. Other ___

43. My high school academic experience was:

a. Good ___

b. Bad ___

c. Adequate ___

d. Other ___

44. As a student-athlete, my primary role on campus is to obtain:

a. Participate in athletics ___

b. An academic degree ___

45. I was academically prepared to attend college at the high school level. ___ Yes ___ No

46. Are you more tolerant of white people as a result of your participation in intercollegiate athletics? ___ Yes ___ No

47. Do you feel that black athletes are lazy? ___ Yes ___ No

48. Do you feel that white athletes are lazy? ___ Yes ___ No

49. Do you feel that black athletes are irresponsible? ___ Yes ___ No

50. Do you feel that white athletes are irresponsible? ___ Yes ___ No

51. Would you consider joining a political party? ___ Yes ___ No

52. Do you like to hear the Star Spangled Banner prior to our athletic contests? ___ Yes ___ No

53. Do you date white coeds? ___ Yes ___ No

54. Do you like to hear the Black National Anthem prior to our athletic contests? ___ Yes ___ No

55. Do you like to see the Confederate flag flying alongside the American flag? ___ Yes ___ No

56. Do you discriminate against white teammates because your friends do? ___ Yes ___ No

57. Do you like to see the Black Nationalist colors flying alongside the American flag? ___ Yes No No

58. Which of the following parties would you join:

    a. Panthers ___

    b. KKK ___

    c. Conservative ___

    d. Demoncratic ___

    e. Republican ___

    f. Communist ___

59. Do you date black coeds? ___ Yes ___ No

60. Do you discriminate against black teammates because your friends do? ___ Yes ___ No

# BLACK ATHLETES: EDUCATIONAL, ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS*

Robert L. Green
Thomas S. Gunnings
Joseph H. McMillan
Gloria S. Smith**

---

*To be published as a monograph of the Journal of Non-White Concerns, a division of the American Personnel and Guidance Association. Please do not quote without written permission of the authors.

**Robert L. Green is dean of the College of Urban Development and director of the Center for Urban Affairs at Michigan State University. Thomas S. Gunnings is assistant dean of student affairs in the MSU College of Human Medicine. Joseph H. McMillan is director of the MSU Department of Human Relations. Gloria S. Smith is assistant director of the MSU Counseling Center.

The authors wish to express their appreciation to Ms. Barbara Parness of the Lyndon Baines Johnson School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin, and Ms. Eugenia Smith and Ms. Janet Canup of the College of Urban Development, for their research and editorial assistance; Ms. Renaye Ambrose for the typing of the manuscript and Dr. Roscoe Brown of New York University for his support and advice in the development of the final document.

Many would hail organized athletics as society's pioneer in providing equal opportunity to black Americans. White Americans believe that sports have always been a wide open field where blacks could excel.

Yet the protests and demands made by black athletes and non-athletes over the past few years are evidence that inequities prevail in organized sports both at the collegiate and professional levels. For example, black students protesting at a Rutgers University basketball game in December 1973 demanded the school hire black head coaches and investigate institutional racism in the university. This demonstration caused the school to forfeit the game.

According to Yetman and Eitzen (1972), "the idea that organized sports has escaped the pervasive effects of racism has become one of the most cherished myths in American life" (p.20).

Green, et al. (1972), also concluded:

> The most glaring fallacy about intercollegiate athletic competition in the United States is the assumption that fairness is inherent. Indeed ... college sports is not the haven of fair play and equal opportunity that we have been led to believe. To black athletes, coaches and officials, fairness and equal opportunity are myths. The patterns of racial discrimination, both overt and covert, institutional and individual, found in the larger society are reflected in and perpetuated by athletics in the United States (p. 12).

Changing the illusion of fairness to fact means altering the administrative and employment policies of college athletic departments; it also means reshaping counseling programs for black athletes and re-evaluating goals and purposes of collegiate athletic programs. By examining the history of black athletic protest and focusing on the demands made by black athletes, especially during the 1972 Big Ten Protest, the authors hope to foster an understanding of the black athlete's dilemma. Understanding the need for change is the first step in removing the barriers to equality and fairness in American sports and American society.

## HISTORY OF BLACK ATHLETIC PROTEST

Black participation in institutionalized sports goes back to the days of slavery (McPherson, 1971) when boxing was a common activity for southern slaves. Matches were held between slaves on the same plantation and between champions from different plantations. A successful boxer would often gain preferential treatment and special status from the plantation owner. By 1890, black boxers were recognized as world champions in most weight divisions.

Blacks were also involved in organized baseball in the 1860's and evidence indicates they participated in a variety of other sports prior to 1900.

In the late 1800's, however, the overt discrimination of the general society began to carry over into the athletic arena. At this time Senator Tillman of South Carolina was advocating the slaughter of 30,000 blacks in his home state and a book entitled The Negro, A Beast was a best seller (Boyle, 1963, p. 103). It's no surprise that in 1891 Sporting Life reported that a feet-first slide into second base was innovated to physically attack and injure a black second baseman (Boyle, 1963, pp. 103-105). Then Charles Dana of the New York Sun warned the public about the growing threat of black supremacy in athletics and particularly in boxing. He wrote that it was humiliating to have blacks dominate the fight division. Soon black boxers had to consent to lose before they could obtain a match.

Until World War II, professional baseball, football and basketball were entirely segregated (Henderson, et al., 1968). The breakthrough in athletics came when Jackie Robinson joined the Brooklyn Dodgers in 1947 and Larry Doby signed with the Cleveland Indians. Golf and tennis, the social sports, did not break racial barriers until the 1960's.

In the late 1940's blacks also began participating in athletics at predominantly white colleges and universities. Spectator interest and the resultant increased gate receipts made it impossible for white schools to continue "to sit idly by and allow Negro colleges to siphon off potentially valuable athletic prospects merely because of an accident of birth" (Govan, 1971, p. 18). White schools began sending recruiters to the South to actively seek out black athletes, particularly football players, who could help pack the stadiums and athletic department coffers.

These athletes were welcome on the field and court, but not on the rest of the campus. McPherson (1971) noted that a frequent complaint of black athletes, collegiate and professional, is that "once they leave the locker room they are subjected to the same prejudices and discrimination as a Harlem resident who ventures out into white society" (p. 10). Olsen (1968) wrote that black athletes feel they are being dehumanized, exploited, and discarded, and some even say they were happier in the black community. A poem entitled the "Black Fullback" expresses the black athlete's feelings very well:

They cheer me in each alien stadium
Like a horse that runs well,
But there is no affection in that mob yell.
The players show some teamwork,
And slap my hands for touchdowns,
But in the stadium I am one of the clowns.
I glory in the running, and the money,
But I am still a thing to sell
Like my forefathers
With the Plantation Bell ... (Carter, 1970, p. 59)

The black who criticizes conditions in American athletics is often branded as "ungrateful, a cur that bites the hand" (Olsen, 1968, p. 15). Nevertheless, black athletes and non-athletes began raising their voices in protest. As early as 1917, Paul Leroy Robeson, a Rutgers University All-American (Edwards, 1971), turned his back on "the recognition derived from playing the role of the 'responsible Negro athlete'" and spoke out against black discrimination and humiliation in a white society (p. 32).

In 1967 a group of black students from San Jose State College met with sociology professor and former athlete Harry Edwards. At this meeting the decision was made to boycott the 1968 Olympic games in Mexico. At another meeting, more than 50 Olympic squad candidates agreed not to compete under the U.S. flag (Edwards, 1968, p.6).

The 1968 Olympic boycott was aimed at breaking what Edwards called the "system of athletic slavery" (1969, p. 16). The boycotters were "dramatizing the hypocrisy of their own situation...Black athletes are beginning to realize that breaking records doesn't alter their own status as second-rate citizens outside the sports arena" (Edwards, 1969, p. 10). Edwards and his supporters (in Olsen, July 1, 1968) accused the American athletic establishment of "setting up false goals, perpetuating prejudice and establishing an insidious bondage all its own" (p. 12).

The proposed Olympic boycott brought the black athlete out of an unreal world of pretended fair play and equality and forced him to identify with the black protest movement in society at large.

> The roots of the revolt of the black athlete spring from the same seed that produced the sit-ins, the freedom rides and the rebellions in Watts, Detroit, and Newark. The athletic revolt springs from a disgust and dissatisfaction with the same racist germ that injected the warped minds responsible for the bomb murders of four black girls as they prayed in a Birmingham, Alabama, church....The revolt of the black athlete arises also from his new awareness of his responsibilities in an increasingly more desperate, violent and unstable America. He is for the first time reacting in a human and masculine fashion to the disparities between the heady artifical world of newspaper clippings, photographers, and screaming spectators and the real world of degradation, humiliation, and horror that confronts the overwhelming majority of Afro-Americans (Edwards, 1970, p. xxvii).

The response to Edwards' boycott plans was hateful. Edwards found his two dogs shot, cut up and dumped on his front porch. He and his staff received death threats almost daily, and sums amounting to more than $125,000 were offered to call off the boycott (Edwards, 1969). But the protest could not be halted and the seed planted by Edwards that year spread to campuses all over the country as black athletes began to demand changes.

On 35 college campuses black athletes stunned coaches and administrators with sweeping demands for change including the addition of black coaches, black trainers, black cheerleaders, and "new black dignity" (Newsweek, July 15, 1968, p. 55). Black basketball players at the University of California at Berkeley rallied behind a player who was thrown off the basketball team for refusing to give up his natural haircut. The athletes presented the university a list of demands which included the hiring of black coaches. The head coach and athletic director subsequently resigned and a popular white coach was named head coach with a black assistant. Berkeley's black football players expected similar treatment. When they did not get it, they walked out of spring practice (Newsweek, July 15, 1968). At the University of Texas at El Paso, black trackmen refused to compete against Brigham Young University because of its racial policies. Black football players at the University of Kansas gave up spring practice to force the school to name a black girl to the "pom-pom" team (Schaap, 1968).

Michigan State University became part of this nationwide unrest in May 1968. Black football players boycotted spring practice and marched to athletic director Biggie Munn's office with the following list of grievances:

1. MSU is not hiring enough black coaches.
2. MSU is discouraging black students from participating in certain sports--especially baseball.
3. MSU does not employ enough blacks in jobs in Jenison Fieldhouse, the Intramural Building, the Ticket Office and the Ice Arena.
4. There are no black trainers or doctors to treat all athletes.
5. The athletic counselor is "under undue pressure" assisting all athletes and should have a black assistant.
6. Academic counseling for blacks is designed to place them in courses where they will maintain eligibility. They are forced to take non-academic courses rather than academic courses that will enable them to graduate in four years.
7. MSU has never elected a black cheerleader.

The university agreed to work toward meeting the football players demands and the two-day boycott was ended. Four years later, however, the Coalition of Black Athletes was challenging the university athletic department to follow through more effectively on these and other promises.

In 1969, ten blacks from Indiana's football squad walked out of two consecutive practice sessions and were dropped from the squad. They released a list of eight grievances similar to those of the MSU athletes. The athletes charged that black players were given inadequate medical attention and their physical and mental welfare was not looked after to the same extent as their white counterparts. They also charged that discouraging and degrading remarks were made about them; and that they were harassed in front of team members. The players said they felt as though they were not being treated as men and that the atmosphere created by the coaching staff was "mentally depressing and morally discouraging" (Detroit Free Press, November 9, 1969).

The black player walkout at Indiana resulted in the team's loss to Iowa which destroyed its chance to go to the Rose Bowl. Two of three black cheerleaders and seven of nine black band members boycotted the game, as did the school's 300 black students (Detroit Free Press, November 10, 1969). Several months later Indiana football coach John Pont said, "If I thought I would be burned (by another boycott), I wouldn't recruit any more black athletes" (Detroit Free Press, February 18, 1970).

Eight black football players at Syracuse University sat out the entire season in a racial dispute with the athletic department. A 12-member committee investigating the boycott stunned the coaching staff when it concluded:

> The definition of the spring boycott merely as an issue of violating coaching authority and the penalizing of black athletes without taking into consideration the broader context of their protest was an act of institutional racism unworthy of a great university (New York Times, December 13, 1970, p. 4).

## THE BIG TEN PROTEST OF 1972

Black athletic protests came to a peak at Michigan State University in 1972. A number of black student athletes, faculty members, administrators, researchers, and a board member had been carefully watching and analyzing discriminatory athletic practices and resultant protests across the nation. In February 1972, a concerned group led by Professors Robert L. Green, Thomas S. Gunnings and Joseph H. McMillan carried a carefully planned and thoughtout protest to the Big Ten Conference leadership.

These professors had a long history of involvement in university affairs and a combined total of 26 years experience in counseling black athletes at MSU. Their presentation to the Big Ten was precipitated by the long chain of overt and covert discriminatory incidents they had witnesses during their association with MSU and the Big Ten conference.

It was based on a well researched report, The Status of Blacks in the Big Ten Athletic Conference: Issues and Concerns (Appendix B), which grew out of a meeting at Dr. Green's home where 25 athletes, an MSU Trustee, and two graduate students trained in research methodology discussed the athlete's concerns and drew up a questionnaire. The questionnaire was taken to Michigan State and eight other Big Ten universities and a systematic study of conference conditions was conducted using the following data sources: present and former black athletes, athletic department employees, university administrators, university records, athletic department publications, current and former coaches, university libraries, counselors, and equal opportunity program coordinators.

This study showed that fairness and equal opportunity were a myth in collegiate sports and that the patterns of racial discrimination found in the larger society were also found in U.S. athletics.

With data to support their conclusion, the professors elicited support for their position from university administrators, faculty, students, the media, and the community. Convincing others of the importance of their position, the professors sent a letter to Big Ten Commissioner Wayne Duke, held a press conference, and were subsequently granted an audience at the March 7 Big Ten leadership meeting.

The concerns of the protest group centered around the following three points:

1. the problems experienced by black athletes as a function of their race
2. the number of black athletes who fail to graduate
3. the lack of black representation at all levels in Big Ten employment, particularly as coaches and officials.

Public response to the charges came immediately. Hate mail began pouring in and critical public statements were issued by politicians, professors and nationally-known sportswriters. A letter writer from Hammond, Indiana, asserted, "It is just becoming my opinion, as well as to friends and associates of mine, that black people do a lot of unnecessary crying." From St. Petersburg, Florida, "I read with amusement your charge that black athletes are being persecuted. It seems to me they are getting all the breaks and big money in athletics now." And from Salem, Oregon, "People are justifiably tired of your ridiculous and irresponsible demands." Green observed to a campus reporter that it appeared as though they "had hit the heartstrings of America and upper middle class white racism."

Many, of course, voiced approval of the black athlete's position. Among these were three MSU Trustees who issued a statement on Feb. 15 supporting the "constructive efforts initiated by MSU faculty members Drs. Robert L. Green, Thomas S. Gunnings and Joseph McMillan to bring an end to discrimination in Big Ten athletics." A local citizen wrote to Dr. Green, "In the long run, you are fighting for all of us--whites as well as blacks." Another letter stated, "It's about time that someone in a position of authority and responsibility had the initiative and the courage to speak the truth about a most pathetic situation of which all of us should be ashamed." Support was also voiced by the Black United Front of the Office of Black Affairs; La Raza Unida de Michigan, a statewide coalition of Spanish-speaking organizations; the NAACP; and the Council of the MSU Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

One of the many causes of the involvement by Professors Green, Gunnings and McMillan in the athletic protest at MSU was the January 1972 suspension by the Big Ten of Ron Behagen and Corky Taylor, two black University of Minnesota basketball players. The suspension came after the two players were involved in a race-related fracas near the end of the Minnesota-Ohio State basketball game. A white Ohio

State player was injured and the game was ended a few minutes ahead of schedule. While there was almost universal condemnation of Behagen and Taylor in the news media, locker rooms and living rooms of white America, Professors Green, Gunnings and McMillan believed there was more to the story than met the eye. While sportscasters bemoaned the entrance of violence into the sports arena, the three black administrators were more concerned about the subtle forms of violence assailing black athletes on white campuses. It was this subtle agression that led to racial conflict at the Minnesota-Ohio State game.

## THE PLIGHT OF THE BLACK COLLEGIATE ATHLETE

In the original letter to Big Ten Commissioner Wayne Duke and in the related press conference, Professors Green, Gunnings and McMillan charged that black athletes are used by their universities then put out to pasture at age 21. Most of these athletes are without college degrees and with little hope of succeeding in professional athletics.

Responding to this, the white sports editor of the campus newspaper wrote that blacks should stop complaining because white athletes face the same problems and overcome them. "The pasture doesn't discriminate," the sports editor wrote.

A white lacrosse player, fortunate enough to be graduating in three and a half years with a high grade point average, published a letter in the campus daily, asking: "Why should an athlete need more than four years to graduate; what is so special about us? I believe I have demonstrated that it can be done and done well. No one made me graduate in less than four years, just as no one tried to make me take longer. I read the catalog on my own, saw the requirements and took them."

In the report to the Big Ten, the three black administrators attempted to combat the naivete of such statements and show that the pasture does indeed discriminate.

The primary reason most students attend a university is to earn a degree. The black athlete, however, must give education a back row seat. His primary role is to perform well in the sports arena.

As one Big Eight basketball coach said (in Olsen, 1968):

> Things are now getting to the point where all a coach has to do is go out and pick up four or five good Negro players and let things take their natural course. In order to succeed, which means to win, he is being forced to resort to what I would bluntly call nothing else but the slave trade. What it amounts to is going out and buying colored boys who can play basketball, regardless of whether they can do any of the other things expected of college students (p. 96).

Edwards agrees that blacks are brought in solely to perform. In most cases, Edwards said, athletes' college lives are educational blanks (in Govan, 1971):

> ...The black athlete in the predominantly white school is first, foremost, and sometimes only, an athletic commodity. He is constantly reminded of this one fact, sometimes subtly and informally, at other times harshly and overtly, but at all times unequivocally. The black athlete is expected to sleep, eat, and drink athletics. His basketball, football or baseball is to be his closest companion, his best friend, and in a very real sense, the symbol and object of his religious concern (p. 20).

As the University of Maryland's athletic director put it, "You do anything to win. I believe completely, totally, and absolutely in winning" (Starnes, 1973, p. 1).

Because the object is to win at any cost, those who do the recruiting of young athletes have been called flesh peddlers. At a meeting of basketball writers in New York City, coaches told of money, cars, department credit cards and off-campus apartments being offered to blue-chip players, the majority of them black (New York Times, December 11, 1973).

A Long Island University coach condemned the tactics of athletic recruiters. He stated that high school students are very impressionable and have delusions of grandeur. They envision themselves as great players and colleges outside of New York City are seen as ivory towers. These athletes sell themselves before they realize the implications of the sale.

## MAINTAINING ELIGIBILITY

The ivory tower viewed from afar by high school athletes loses its luster when seen from close by. The athletic activity which once seemed the key to opportunity now serves to lock these students into an athletic dilemma.

The black athlete must remain eligible if he wants to keep his scholarship and continue his education. Yet he must often accept a second-rate, non-academic education, so he does not jeopardize his grade point average and thus his eligibility.

For example, athletes are frequently encouraged by athletic departments to major in physical education rather than calculus or engineering. They are often steered to courses taught by sympathetic professors who may be willing to pass a star performer regardless of his classroom performance (Green, et al., 1972). The black athlete is deceived into believing his success as a student is irrelevant since he is headed toward a long and profitable career in professional athletics; alternatives are not made known to him.

In reality, few college athletes ever achieve professional status (Green, et al., 1972). As Charles G. Hurst, former professor and college president, said, "There is nothing less wanted in our society than a worn-out Negro athlete" (Olsen, 1968, p. 12). Michael Govan (1971) explains the motivation behind the athletic department's actions:

> From the perspective of many white coaches and athletic directors, the world does not need black doctors, sociologists, chemists, dentists, mathematicians, computer operators, or biologists. Moreover, such lofty academic goals might jeopardize a black athlete's college career and thus wipe out the college's financial investment in him (p.20).

In the report to the Big Ten, MSU statistics were cited to show that black athletes have a far more difficult time getting through the university than the average MSU student. The average white athlete, on the other hand, has a significantly greater chance of graduating than the average MSU student. Of 156 letter winners in football, basketball, wrestling and track who were freshmen at MSU between fall 1960 and fall 1964, 113 were white and 43 were black. Eighty-three percent of the white athletes and 46.3 percent of the black athletes had graduated by November 1970. MSU figures also show that black athletes take an average of 1.4 terms (15 terms compared to 16.4 terms) longer to finish than the average white athlete (Green, et al., 1972). Figures from other universities show similar patterns of failure for black student athletes. At the University of Washington between 1957-67, seven black football players graduated, 13 did not; at the University of Oregon between 1965-68, six black athletes graduated, five did not; at the University of Utah only 12 of 46 black athletes eventually received degrees; and at Utah State only nine of 40 black athletes graduated (Olsen, July 1, 1968).

The Big Ten report (1972) concluded that black athletes have low graduation rates primarily because their coaches, instructors and student peers expect them to exhibit poor academic characteristics. The direct relationship between expectations and educational performance has been well documented in the literature of educational psychology (Brookover and Erickson, 1969; Robert L. Green, 1969; Thomas S. Gunnings, 1971; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968).

The black athlete usually enters the white university with a secondary education from an educationally unsound school system. This system was likely understaffed and educationally inadequate according to all the traditional measures. He enters the white university with a poor academic self-image and his experiences in higher education reinforce this picture. Johnson's (1972) study of black student athletes and the conflict between their roles as blacks, students and athletes supports this viewpoint. Johnson found that all black athletes believed their coaches expected them to remain eligible, but only seven percent believed that their coaches expected them to earn degrees. Seventy percent believed their white coaches, professors and students expected them to be weak academically.

The black student athlete works in the classroom and on the playing field under extraordinary pressures - pressures which are a direct function of his race. The black student athlete knows that if he loses his eligibility or if he is not a superstar in his field, he will not have his financial support or scholarship program renewed the following year. Usually he has no other source of financial aid to keep him in school.

## STACKING AGAINST THE BLACK ATHLETE

The pressure to excel in the sports arena is enhanced by "stacking," the practice of pitting black athletes against each other for relatively few positions while other positions are declared off limits to them. Rosenblatt (1967) noted that in 1965 there were twice as many pitchers as outfielders on a baseball team, but there were three times as many black outfielders as black pitchers. Coaches deny that such policies are actually followed, but stacking continues in statistically provable amounts (Bledsoe, 1973). In both professional and collegiate football, blacks have been almost completely excluded from quarterback, center and linebacker positions which are assumed to require greater mental faculties than physical ability (Brower, 1972). Another reason for "stacking" is the suspicion that whites will not respond to black leadership in positions like quarterback in professional football (Schaap, 1968).

This belief, however, is unfounded. For example, Cornelius Green, Ohio State quarterback had been editorially labeled a non-passer. When given the opportunity to demonstrate leadership under stress, he became a pass wizzard and carried Ohio State, the Big Ten representative, to a miraculous Rose Bowl victory in 1974.

Although there are still only two black quarterbacks in professional football, there are probably hundreds of Cornelius Green's who never get the opportunity to demonstrate their leadership because the system refuses to believe it can be led by people of color.

Other forms of discrimination against black athletes result from the stacking policy in professional sports. For example, approximately three-quarters of all financially lucrative advertising spots in radio, television and newspapers allotted to pro football players in 1971 went to those in central positions, i.e., to white athletes. In addition, players in non-central positions have significantly shorter playing careers, thus limiting the black players' lifetime earnings and benefits from the players' pension fund (Yetman and Eitzen, 1972). The Equal Opportunity Commission reported in 1968 that black athletes appeared in only five percent of 351 television commercials associated with New York sports events during fall 1966. It is important to remember that the stacking practice has its roots in the collegiate athletic establishment and could not be effective in professional sports if not supported at the college level.

Black athletes are aware of this racially discriminatory practice and some have taken steps to beat the white athletic establishment at the game. Gene Washington, black member of the San Francisco Forty-Niners, offered this explanation for his shift from quarterback to wide receiver while still in college:

> It was strictly a matter of economics. I knew a black quarterback would have little chance in pro ball unless he was absoultely superb. What usually happens is that a pro team tells you there's no place for you at quarterback, but they can use you as a defensive back or flanker. And then they tell you they can't give you as much money because you'd be learning a new position. So I decided to beat them to it. (Bledsoe, p. 18).

While blacks fight to open up the "white" positions in football, other sports remain almost entirely closed to them. Charlie Sifford succeeded in golf, previously a white man's game, but it took him 20 difficult years to do it (Johnson, 1969). Black men have gained little access to the game because the best courses are out of bounds for them and they are unable to get the early expert instruction they need. Golfer George Johnson explains how he developed a short backswing:

> I got it from tiptoein' out on a course before dawn--in the moonlight sometimes--then peekin' over my shoulder real quick to see if anyone was watchin' and then whackin' through with the fastest, shortest swing you ever saw so I could hit that ball and get moving before I got caught" (Johnson, 1969, p. 69).

Another golfer, Pete Brown, said that in Mississippi blacks were not allowed to play golf, so he and some of the other black caddies would sneak onto the course at dawn or late at night.

"If nothing else," said golfer George Thorpe, "playing by moonlight sure teaches you how to keep the ball on the fairway" (Time, February 14, 1969, p. 56).

Hockey is another virtually all white sport. Alton White, a Canadian, was the first black to sign a contract with a World Hockey Association team, the New York Raiders. This was not until 1972. Another black, Willie O'Ree, played in 45 games for the Boston Bruins, a member of the National Hockey League. White said he knew of no reason why a black man should not be able to play big league hockey as well as a white man (State Journal, June 1, 1972, p. C-7).

## LACK OF BLACK EMPLOYMENT

Discrimination against blacks is not limited to athletic team members, collegiate and professional athletics frequently show racial prejudice in their general employment practices. A major complaint of protesting black athletes is the dearth of black coaches and officials. Although blacks constitute half of all big-league basketball players, the percentages "shrink to the border of invisibility at the managerial and executive end of sports" (Schaap, p. 73). Art Williams was the first black to see a full season with the National League umpiring staff and this was not until 1973 (Detroit Press , March 22, 1973). A black manager has yet to be appointed in major league baseball.

The collegiate picture is equally bleak. The study of eight Big Ten universities revealed that only one black held the position of assistant athletic director and no blacks held other administrative or management positions. Of those blacks on coaching staffs, all were assistant or freshman coaches with poorly defined responsibilities and lack of full coaching responsibilities, including budget authority. Many black coaches felt their only responsibility was recruiting black athletes (Green et al., 1972).

At the time of the Big Ten study, only one of 40 football officials in the conference was black and only one of 36 basketball officials was black. Blacks made up only 3.9 percent of the athletic governing boards of the seven Big Ten universities studied.

In addition to the absence of blacks in coaching, officiating and governing roles, the survey of Big Ten schools found that in seven schools there were no black clerical employees, secretaries, publicity directors or team doctors in the athletic departments. There were only two black trainers and a few black custodians (Green et al., 1972, p. 8).

## SOCIAL DISCRIMINATION

The problems of the black athlete extend beyond sports and academics into social life. "Any black athlete who states that he has never encountered discrimination," said black tennis player Arthur Ashe, "is either lying or is incorrigibly naive. Off the field he is just another black man..." (Schaap, 1968, p. 7[illegible].

The black athlete comes to the college campus with an unreal picture of what his new life will be. This is partially because recruiters have deliberately conspired to keep him away from black athletes already on campus who can give a complete and honest picture of campus life. The social life of the black student on the white campus has been described as one of "loneliness, exclusion and the consequent destruction of the Negro's pride" (Olsen, July 15, 1968, p. 33). Govan (1971) wrote that the black athlete is "typically exploited, abused, dehumanized, and cast aside in much the same manner as a worn basketball.... His life is riddled with insults, humiliations, and all other manner of degrading experiences" (p. 22).

Edwards (1970), who has personal experience as a black student on a white campus, wrote:

> Typically, segregation within an ostensibly integrated context has been the rule for the black student. The fact has been driven home, both subtly and directly, that his presence on the predominantly white campus is primarily maintained at the sufferance of liberal whites, and, that beyond this presence, he has little legitimacy--if any--in the college community (p. 55).

When Edwards enrolled in San Jose State College in 1960, he was promised many fine things and told that he would be accepted socially. However, not one of the school's 16 fraternities would pledge him or any other black student. He was not invited to white social functions and said that better restaurants were out of bounds. When he returned to San Jose as a teacher, the situation had changed very little. He still could not find a decent place to live. Another San Jose athlete told Edwards that 13 people had denied him and his pregnant wife housing during their search for it. (Edwards, 1968).

Other black athletes, collegiate and professional, have had similar experiences. O.J. Simpson won many awards as a football and track star at the University of Southern California. Ironically, he could not become a member of 90 percent of the groups that honored him (Edwards, 1968). Heisman trophy winner Mike Garret was called a troublemaker when he exploded in print because an apartment was unavailable to him (Edwards, 1968).

Dallas Cowboys' fullback Don Perkins told of discrimination in Dallas (Astor, 1969). Cab companies would not allow their drivers to pick him up. "You'll just have to call the colored companies" he was told (Astor, 1969, p. 83). Apartment owners also turned him away. "The places we got were so bad that, until this year, we never lived in an apartment that wasn't infested with roaches" Perkins said (Astor, 1969, p. 83). When the team traveled, Perkins said, the players were segregated. If there was an odd couple, the white player would be in a single room and the black player would be in another (Astor, 1969).

As William Russell (1970) put it, too many coaches view athletes as performers and not as people. "No coach should ask a boy to join his team unless he also would ask him to come into his house" (p.82).

## INTERPERSONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Not only is the black athlete faced with these pressures but he also faces problems in his relationships with others on campus. The attention he received during recruitment is no longer there and in some instances he actually faces rejection. The feeling of "belonging," which he has as a member of the team, vanishes when the social aspect comes into play. The black athlete cannot join the organizations or attend the parties and dances that fellow white athletes do because he is not really accepted or wanted. He also has problems fraternizing with the black students because he has been made to feel that he is special and superior to them. The black athlete can look at other black students who are now on campus and display the attitude that "if I or some athlete like me hadn't come here, you wouldn't be here."

Sometimes the black athlete will turn to the white female for companionship. To him, this is proof that all avenues really are open to him and he can conquer the unconquerable. This relationship is usually not satisfying, however, because the black athlete and white female as a couple are not accepted by either black or white social groups. In addition, it is taboo for a black athlete to date a white female. A Washington football player was thrown off the team after being seen with a white woman (Olsen, 1968).

Dating a white woman further alienates the black athlete from black women. The black female views this as the ultimate weapon a black man can use to show his disapproval of the black female. Edwards (in Govan, 1971) describes the black athlete's predicament:

> Outside the athletic arena, the life of the black athlete is lonely, monotonous, and unrewarding, even before he enrolls at the white school. He may be a big hero on the field or on the court, but in street clothes and even in the team locker rooms, he resumes his status as 'just another nigger'. These conditions are part of the shame and glory that fall to black athletes on predominantly white college campuses (p. 22).

Before he has the chance to make a lasting imprint on the white university, the black athlete develops a split personality. At the same time he is a hero and a scoundrel--the boy that everyone loves and the person no one wants to be bothered with socially. This type of dual treatment of the black athlete could psychologically maim him for life.

## COUNSELING THE BLACK ATHLETE

Amidst these paradoxes, the black athlete must keep his balance. Therefore, it is necessary for counselors to prepare themselves to deal effectively with the many issues confronting the black athlete. Counselors must be able to relate to the black athlete from the athlete's frame of reference. Horace Mitchell (1971) believes it is necessary that "the counselor accurately understand the environment to which blacks must respond and interpret black behavior within the context of that environment" (p. 118). The counselor must not assume that he knows more about what is good for the athlete than the athlete does, but must work with him to help make life more liveable.

Gunnings (1971) refers to the importance of this two-way counseling relationship.

> The posture of 'knowing better than the student what's best for him' is presumptuous and dangerous. Not only does it ensure lack of confidence, but also it completely opposes that sensitivity and 'openness' to the student as a person that should be essential to any counseling relationship. Confidentiality must be maintained if the student is to view the counselor as anything other than an agent of the school who is operating only in the interest of staff and administration (p. 156).

The counselor must assume a preventive and developmental role and should work with the student in helping to insure his athletic, academic and social survival.

The systemic counseling approach must be employed in this situation since the problems, conflicts and frustrations facing the black athlete are clearly based on his color. Because the black athlete cannot change his color, the only solution is for the system to change its attitudes. Gunnings and Simpkins (1972) describe the basics of systemic counseling:

> The systemic model is based on the assumption that most of the problems are in actuality system problems. The main emphasis of this approach, then, is for the clinician to treat the system for its problems, thereby bring about changed individuals. The systemic approach stresses a reordering of priorities, emphasis and goals and is strategic in bringing about long term effects on behavioral changes and personality development. This model integrates the cognitive, affective, and psychomotor areas of the individual into an organic whole (pp. 4-5).

The counselor of the black athlete in a predominantly white institution must be prepared to be an innovator and change agent. To be effective, he must know and understand the economic, political, and social perceptions of the institution and of society. He must be prepared to deal with the specific problems of the black athlete. This includes knowing about the athlete's social, academic and personality crises. It also includes knowing the effects of university and athletic politics on the athlete's life.

## THE POLITICS OF SPORTS

It is perhaps difficult for the layman to understand the phenomenon of political involvement in sports. However, politics hold an influential position in sports because sports are big business. The athlete is a product to be marketed and his value is seen in the profit and loss statement.

Politics in sports wear many guises. For example, politics frequently govern the amount of publicity an athlete receives. No matter how proficient he is on the field, recognition of his achievements is directly related to how much coverage the coach dictates the athlete will receive. Some coaches have been known to "bench" a player when professional scouts are recruiting or verbally build up undeserving players when interviewed by the news media. When a black athlete refuses to follow the coach's wishes or when he "rocks the boat" by speaking out against the abuses of his environment he may be denied publicity. If an athlete receives inadequate publicity, he may be overlooked for special teams such as All American. This systematically reduces the athlete's chances of playing professionally.

The black athlete must be counseled to understand the politics of sports. An athlete who thinks he will make the team because of his unique skills is doomed to frustration and failure. He must learn to play the politics of sports to his own advantage and get out as much as he puts into it.

## REALISTIC CAREER GOALS AND ALTERNATIVES

It is common for the black athlete in a predominantly white institution to feel that his present and future world is embodied in athletics. In most instances, the black athlete would not be in college except for his physical abilities. Naturally, he would conclude that his physical and mesomorphic characteristics should be the guiding basis for his future plans. This hope of pursuing a career in professional athletics frequently does not materialize for a black college athlete, as only a few athletes are recruited professionally each year. Therefore, the black athlete should equip himself with some viable alternatives. It is up to the counselor to help the black athlete understand that although athletics are a part of his college career, it is also important to acquire an education and certification.

Edwards (in Govan, 1971) has advanced a very progressive posture relating to the black athlete. The black athlete who receives permanent injuries which preclude his involvement in sports has few options for reconciliation. Not only does he suffer economically, but he may have sustained a permanent psychological miscarriage. The sports world lends little or no attention to the exceptional black who has aborted his potential by physical injury. As in slavery, blacks are bought and sold on the basis of their physique, health and ability to produce. Once those attributes have been lost, the black athlete is expendable. That is why it is important for the athlete to pursue a course of study that leads to a degree. The counselor must help the black athlete keep his priorities straight.

The coach, athletic director, alumni society, and predominantly white student body perceive the athlete as an athletic product first and foremost and therefore an economic investment. These people are not especially concerned with the athlete's life beyond the playing field. However, it is the coach or some member of his department that determines the fate of the black athlete. The athlete must not let the coach become a personal, social and academic counselor. A Sports Illustrated article (1968) puts it this way:

> It is in the hands of the coach that the Negro athlete places his entire career. Other students are accountable to and watched over by the dean, the class advisor, the dorm counselor and parents, but for the black athlete all of these power figures are relegated into secondary roles. It is the coach who tells the black athlete when to get up in the morning and when to get to bed at night, what to eat, whom to live with and how to conduct himself on campus. Nor does the control end there. Many coaches advise the black athlete on what courses to take...(p. 20).

Not only must the black athlete work toward a degree, but he must work toward a viable degree that offers potential job opportunities. Russell (1970) believes that if a college offers an athletic scholarship, it should also offer a guarantee that the athlete will graduate. The athlete must not, as Govan (1971) stated, be one who "... falls by the wayside or takes his press clippings, trophies, awards, and his four years of irrelevant education and looks for any job he can find" (p. 20). This means the athlete must take courses that lead to competency based skills and not courses that lead toward a "holding or maintenance pattern." The athlete must do more than remain eligible for sports, he must first look out for himself. No one wants the star athlete to flunk out. It is only natural that if the athlete is enrolled in solid courses at the height of his career he will get better tutorial assistance, more personal understanding and his chances of academic growth will be greatly improved. After all, academic growth and development and not football should be the name of the game.

## AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Affirmative action programs have become an integral part of American policy since the Civil Rights Act was strengthened in 1964 and the Education Amendments were passed in 1972. Universities, which receive sizable federal grants to carry out research, have felt the impact of affirmative action programs. Most affirmative action provisions, however, cover students in general, and the rights of women, Chicanos, blacks and other minorities. Athletes are not traditional students and should not be accorded traditional treatment.

Some students are recruited by a university because they are economically disadvantaged and the university wants to give them an opportunity to perform academically. Support mechanisms such as tutorial and financial assistance are set up to help them through. Other students are recruited because they have high academic potential. Perhaps they are National Merit Scholarship winners. These students are recruited into the university to profit from the university's educational experience and to bring prestige to the university.

The athlete is the only student who is recruited for the major purpose of playing and performing. He is there merely to provide an enjoyable experience for the general university community. When a coach goes out to recruit an athlete, he will ignore the student who has high grades and low athletic ability. But, if the student has high athletic ability and low academic potential, he is sought after. A music student recruited to the university has high grades and plays a musical instrument well. That student is sought after because he has high academic and musical promise and not just musical promise.

Whether the student be an athlete or musician, however, once that student is enrolled, the university has an obligation to make sure he has every advantage and opportunity to complete his degree. To deny the student any opportunity to complete his education is a form of mistreatment and discrimination.

## IMPLICATIONS FOR COUNSELING

The black student athlete on the white college campus, as illustrated above, is unique in terms of his requirements for academic and personal counseling. To date, no college or university seems to be addressing adequately his counseling needs.

Black athletic protests alone are not going to reverse the racial practices of the nation's athletic departments. Only a reversal of societal racial policies will accomplish this. Pressure from black athletes and faculty members can, however, bring about some changes. In the year and a half since the MSU report was made to the Big Ten leadership, the conference has taken steps to hire a black associate commissioner and has approved a fifth-year plan of financial support for athletes unable to complete their degree requirements in four years.

It is still quite clear, however, that little is being done on the individual school level to mitigate the frustrating situation of the black student athlete. Therefore, the following recommendations are directed to counselors at predominantly white institutions:

1. Black and white college and university counselors must form a coalition to present the black student athlete's case to appropriate officials in the school administration and to the leadership of the school's athletic conference. The legitimacy of the athletes' case can only be strengthened by a black-white coalition that will encourage white administrators and the white community to give greater credence to the unique counseling needs of black athletes.

2. Academic counseling for all athletes should be removed from the athletic departments and placed in the hands of counselors whose major concern will be the educational needs of the student rather than his continued eligibility at any cost. There should be enough counselors to meet the requirements of all athletes. Minority counselors should be hired to work with all athletes, but they should also speak to the immediate needs of minority athletes.

3. A personal counseling program for black athletes should be developed to help the black student on the white campus deal with his new social situation. A similar program for white athletes should also be instituted if there is an assesed need for such a program.

4. University counselors, both black and white must push the university to employ greater numbers of black people in meaningful jobs at all levels within the athletic department. The employment of blacks in significant capacities can provide relevant role models important in the black athlete's academic and personal development.

5. The recruiting program for athletes should be overhauled to give black students a realistic picture of the schools they choose to attend. Every prospective black recruit should be encouraged to consult with a school counselor during his visit to campus to discuss the educational and personal problems he may confront in the white campus community. Minority counselors should work with coaches involved in the recruitment process so that they will not make promises to athletes that violate conference regulations or which they cannot honor.

6. University counselors should begin a liason program with high schools in those states supplying the greatest number of black athletes to the school. The purpose of this program would be to educate high school counselors on the real problems of black student athletes so that the student and his high school counselor can make realistic educational and career decisions.

7. The athletic governing board of every college and university should make provisions to include in its membership at least one faculty member in the field of minority counseling, either with vote or ex officio. The presence of a counseling expert will provide a new perspective on the council which must be taken into account as certain decisions affecting the student athletes are deliberated.

## CONCLUSION

The protest cries of the American black athlete have not fallen on deaf ears. Although erasure of discrimination is slow, it may be forthcoming. As a result of the 1972 Big Ten protest, for example, the Big Ten Board of Commissioners appointed a five-member special commission to review the pressing problems of black athletes and recommend solutions. The special Advisory Commission, composed of distinguished blacks with a background in athletics, studied the protesters' demands independent of the Green, McMillan and Gunnings report and arrived at essentially the same conclusions. Consequently, the conference rules of eligibility were revised to include a provision for curriculum content requirements for those on athletic scholarships. This would insure that black athletes receive a relevant education leading to a degree, rather than only accumulate numerous credits in non-academic courses. The fifth-year financial aid program was also approved.

The Advisory Commission also recommended that mechanisms be devised for hiring black coaches, educational programs be set up to improve the coaches' ability to communicate with blacks, and academic athletic counseling be established to help athletes choose their curriculum content and progress toward a degree. This counseling would be independent of the athletic coaches and director.

Many independent schools have followed through even beyond the requirements of the conference. For example, MSU has named blacks as assistant athletic director, assistant track coach, two assistant football coaches, trainer and equipment manager.

While these moves represent progress, there is still more to be done if racial discrimination is to be banished entirely from the sports arena. For example, blacks are qualified and should be named as head coaches and not only assistant coaches. Counseling programs and in-service seminars must be further enriched to acclimate black athletes to their situation at the university. These programs will also foster university community awareness of the problems involved and help white coaches and athletic administrators understand their minority clientele.

An understanding of the black athlete's dilemma will lead to the realization that the changes called for will help all athletes, black and white, receive fair treatment and a quality education.

Education is, after all, the primary function of the university, and college and university counselors, administrators, and coaches have a responsibility to see that education is carried out. While college athletics are big business, they should not be allowed to take first priority in lives of athletes to the extent that their future livelihood, emotional health, and place in society are jeopardized. Athletics _can_ become a doorway to equal opportunity for blacks, but first, the barriers of racial prejudice must be removed.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amdur, Neil. Campus Crossfire: Coaches Trapped Between Dissenting Athletes and Rigid Policies. New York Times, December 13, 1970.

Astor, Gerald. The Black and White Cowboys. Look, January 7, 1969, p. 83.

Bledsoe, Terry. Black Dominance of Sports: Strictly From Hunger. The Progressive, June, 1973.

Boyle, Robert H. Sport--Mirror of American Life. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1963.

Brookover, W.B. and Erickson, E.L. Society, Schools and Learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Brower, Jonathan J. The racial basis of the division of labor among players in the National Football League as a function of racial stereotypes. Paper presented at the Pacific Sociological Association meetings, Portland, Oregon, April 13-15, 1972.

Detroit Free Press. 1st NL Black Ump Set to Call Balls and Strikes. March 22, 1973.

Detroit Free Press. Black Gridders at Indiana List Their 8 Grievances. November 9, 1969.

Detroit Free Press. Blacks Plan Demonstration at Sugar Bowl. December 26, 1973.

Detroit Free Press. Coaches Cautious over Blacks. February 18, 1970.

Detroit Free Press. Racial Turmoil Hurt--Pont. November 10, 1969.

Durso, Joseph. A Black Manager: Who Will Be First? New York Times, March 11, 1973.

Edwards, Harry. Introduction to 'After the Olympics: Buying off protest' by Jack Scott and Harry Edwards. Ramparts, November, 1969, p. 16.

Edwards, Harry. The Revolt of the Black Athlete. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Edwards, Harry. Quoted in Olsen, The Black Athlete--A Shameful Story: Part One--The Cruel Deception. Sports Illustrated, July, 1968.

Edwards, Harry. Black Students. New York: The Free Press, 1970.

Edwards, Harry. The Sources of the Black Athlete's Superiority. The Black Scholar, November, 1971, pp. 32-41.

Edwards, Harry. Why Negroes Should Boycott Whitey's Olympics. Saturday Evening Post, March 9, 1968, pp. 6-10.

Govan, Michael. The Emergence of the Black Athlete in America. The Black Scholar, Vol. 3, November, 1971, p. 20.

Green, Robert L. The Urban School Child. In R. L. Green (Ed.), Racial Crisis in American Education. Chicago: Follett Educational Corp., 1969.

Green, Robert L., McMillan, Joseph H., Gunnings, Thomas S. The Status of Blacks in the Big Ten Athletic Conference: Issues and Concerns. Presented to the Big Ten Athletic Conference, Chicago, Illinois, March 7, 1972.

Gunnings, Thomas S. Counselors and Confidentiality. School Counselor, January, 1971, p. 156.

Gunnings, Thomas S. Preparing the New Counselor. The Counseling Psychologist, Vol. 2, 1971.

Gunnings, Thomas S. and Simpkins, Gary. A Systemic Approach to Counseling Disadvantaged Youth. Journal of Non-White Concerns, Vol. 1, October, 1972, pp. 4-5.

Henderson, Edward B. and the Editors of Sports Magazine. The Black Athlete: Emergence and Arrival. International Library of Negro Life and History. New York: Publishers Company, Inc., 1969.

Johnson, L. T. B. The Interaction of Soul, Mind and Body: A Study of the Role Compatibility, Role Conflict, and Role Resolutions of Black Student Athletes on a Predominantly White University Campus. Unpublished master's thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1972.

Johnson, William. Call Back the Years. Sports Illustrated, XXX, March 31, 1969, pp. 56-59.

McPherson, Barry D. The Black Athlete: An Overview and Analysis. Presented at the conference on sport and social deviancy, Brockport, New York, December 9-11, 1971, p. 118.

Mitchell, Horace. Counseling Black Students: A Model in Response to The Need for Relevant Counseling Training Programs. The Counseling Psychologist, Vol. 2, 1971, p. 118.

Newsweek. The Angry Black Athlete. July 15, 1968, pp. 56-60.

Olsen, Jack. The Black Athlete--A Shameful Story; Part one--The Cruel Deception. Sports Illustrated, July 1, 1968.

Olsen, Jack. The Black Athlete--Part three: In an Alien World. Sports Illustrated, July 15, 1968.

Olsen, Jack. The Black Athlete: A Shameful Story. New York: Time-Life Books, 1968.

Rosenblatt, Aaron. Negroes in Baseball: The Failure of Success. Trans-Action 4, September, 1967, pp. 51-53.

Russell, William F. Success is a Journey. Sports Illustrated, Vol. XXXII, June 8, 1970, pp. 80-93.

Schaap, Dick. The Revolt of the Black Athlete. Look, Vol. 32, August 6, 1968, pp. 72-76.

Simon, Rita James and Casey, James W. The Phantom Racist . Trans-Action, IV, November, 1966, pp. 5-11.

Sports Illustrated. All American Problem. May 6, 1968, p. 8.

Starnes, Richard. An Unprecedented Economic and Ethical Crisis Grips Big-Time Intercollegiate Sports. Chronicle of Higher Education, September 24, 1973.

State Journal. WHA Raiders Sign Black. June 1, 1972, p. C-7.

Time. Golf: Moonlighting Players. February 14, 1969, p. 56.

Yetman, Norman R. and Eitzen, Stanley D. Black Americans in sports: Unequal opportunity for equal ability. Civil Rights Digest, August, 1972.

## QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Structure of University Covernance - Board of Regents or its equivalent.

1. The number and length of terms of the board members.

   a. How are they chosen?

   b. Are their terms staggered?

2. How many black members on the board?

   a. How long has he (she) served?

   b. Is this the first black to serve?

   c. Name and address of black member(s).

   d. What, if any, unusual circumstances were associated with his selection (e.g. demonstrations)?

II. Board of Directors of Athletics or its equivalent.

1. What is its name at your school?

2. How many members?

   a. How are they chosen?

   b. What are their terms?

   c. Is your Big Ten Faculty Representative a member?

3. Are there any black members on this board?

   a. His name, occupation, and address.

   b. When did he (she) join?

   c. What, if any, unusual circumstances were associated with his selection (e.g. demonstration)?

   d. Is he the first black member? If no, who was and when

## III. Athletic Department

1. Names and position of blacks in administrative or managerial positions.

2. Total number of black coaches and their positions by sport.

   a. Are they the only coach in this position, e.g. offensive coach vs. offensive backfield coaches.

   b. Is he given full coaching responsibilities or does he just run errands, recruit, etc.?

3. Are there any other blacks employed at other levels? If so, how many and how long have they been there (e.g. custodial, clerical, secretarial, trainers, medical personnel, publicity, etc.)?

IV. 1. Do you know of any blacks who have ever been interviewed for head coach positions?

Names and Sport:

2. Have any player's Wives applied for jobs with the Athletic Department? Were they hired? (Please give these answers by race)

V. Coaches backgrounds (head coaches)

1. What proportion graduated from a Big Ten school?

2. What proportion played professionally?

3. What proportion had previous college experience:

    a. As assistant coach.

    b. As head coach.

VI. 1. What is the background of the athletic director?

2. What is the background and department of the Big Ten Faculty Representative?

VII. Athletic Counseling

1. Does the Athletic Department control the counseling of the Athletes? If yes, answer 2 and 3.

2. Are black athletes allowed to seek additional counseling from the regular counseling services or the black affairs counseling services?

3. Are there any informal methods by which black athletes are counseled? (e.g. a black coach who has counseling experience)

4. Are athletes channeled into particular areas (e.g. PE or business, etc.)? Any difference by race - now? In the past? (if yes, how long ago and what changed this pattern?)

VIII. Are there any black cheerleaders? If yes, how long have there been blacks in this position? Was their inclusion prompted by any unusual circumstances? If yes, what?

## IX. Academics and Athletics

1. Graduation by race and overall for entering freshmen percentage by length of time required (four years, five years, etc.).

2. Graduation of athletes, overall and by race and sport percentage by time required (four years, five years, etc.) (1 and 2 should extend back ten years and if data is available back to the first appearance of black athletes at your school)

3. Department in which degrees were attained by race and sport.

4. What type of financial support, if any, is provided if eligibility runs out (by race and sport)?

5. Do black athletes tend to complete their degrees only after leaving and then re-entering school? Why? How does this compare to white athletes?

6. How does the academic standing of the entering athletes (by race) compare with the entering class (by race) with the university averages?

## X. Athletic Standing

1. Are there any sports which blacks are discouraged from entering? If so, how (lack of scholarships, etc.)?

2. Do players retain the position for which they were recruited; compare by race?

3. Compare the standing - number of letters and significant awards (list) of the white and black athletes.

4. What is the standing and team position of standing players, by race?

5. Does stacking of black athletes exist? If yes, what positions?

6. What is the racial breakdown of standing teams?

7. What proportion of athletes, by race, play two or more sports?

8. What proportion of athletes, by race, have letters in two or more sports?

9. What proportion (and numbers) by race are drawn from:

   a. local area (within 200 miles)

   b. within state

   c. out of state by region and race:
   East, West, North, South, Midwest

10. Do black athletes get good PR? Is this consistently the case in all sports? If not, which sports differ?

XI. Black Officials

1. In your experience in the Big Ten, how many black officials have you seen? (list by sport and name)

2. In your experience in the Big Ten, how many black scorekeepers, timers, etc. have you seen? (list by sport and name)

3. Do you know any blacks who have applied for positions as officials in the Big Ten? If so, who?

XII. Have any black athletes been discouraged from or penalized from membership in black student organizations?

# THE STATUS OF BLACKS
# IN THE BIG TEN ATHLETIC CONFERENCE: ISSUES AND CONCERNS

March 7, 1972

Prepared by

Robert L. Green
Director, Center for Urban Affairs
Professor, Educational Psychology
Michigan State University

Joseph H. McMillan
Director, Equal Opportunity Programs
Michigan State University

Thomas S. Gunnings
Assistant Director, Minority Counseling
Michigan State University

With the assistance of

The Coalition of Black Athletes
Michigan State University

and

Black Athletes throughout the Big Ten Conference

As black administrators in a Big Ten university who have known and counseled many black athletes, we are vitally concerned about the plight of black athletes in the Big Ten Athletic Conference. As we stated in the original list of concerns forwarded to Big Ten Athletic Commissioner Wayne Duke, we are very concerned about the problems experienced by black athletes as a function of their race; the number of black athletes who fail to complete their formal education; and the lack of representation by blacks at all levels in Big Ten employment, particularly at the coaching and officiating levels. Evidence that gives credence to our charges of racial discrimination in the Big Ten Athletic Conference is contained in this report.

While we have focused on the unique plight of black athletes, we are aware that very often less fortunate white athletes are afflicted by some of the very same problems that face black athletes. However, we also acknowledge that whenever black people make progress in terms of social movement, everyone stands to gain from that action.

## Research Procedures

A number of procedures were followed to gather the data for this report. The questions that needed to be answered at each university were discussed and listed and these were then combined into a questionnaire (See Appendix A). Possible sources of data to answer the questions were identified. The sources utilized in data collection included:

1. *present and former black athletes*
2. *employees of the various athletic departments*
3. *university administrators*

4. *university records*
5. *athletic department publications*
6. *current and former coaches*
7. *university libraries*
8. *counselors*
9. *equal opportunity program coordinators*
10. *newspaper editors*
11. *and other concerned persons.*

Two researchers collected data on eight Big Ten universities by telephone, visits to the campuses, and from a joint meeting of black athletes and faculty members held on March 2, 1972, at the Sheraton-O'Hare in Rosemont, Illinois. They spoke with numerous persons at each school. Those interviewed ranged from students and secretaries to vice chancellors and vice presidents of the universities.

Information from each university was collected as per the questionn in Appendix A. Where there were conflicting reports from separate independe sources, additional contacts were made in order to collect accurate data.

## Black Athletes and Education

The primary purpose for attending a university should be to get an education and not to play sports. This should be the case for both black and white athletes. However, because of the importance of athletics to the university in the areas of finances, publicity, and alumni support, the roles of the athlete and the student often become reversed. The role of the athlete is seen as more important than the role of the student. This can occur through the actions of athletic personnel and counselors when they subvert a student's educational needs to the need to keep him athletically eligible.

In an excellent study of the roles of black student athletes at one Big Ten university, Johnson (1972) investigated the relative importance of and the conflicts between roles as blacks, as athletes, and as students. Of the black student athletes in the study, 100 percent reported that their coaches expected them to remain eligible, but only seven percent reported that their coaches expected them to receive their degree. Seventy percent reported that their white coaches and professors and white students expected them to be weak academically. These findings clearly indicate that black students who happen to play sports perceive that they are seen by the establishment as being primarily athletes and not academically oriented students. This perception can only harm them in the pursuit of their education. One hundred percent of the students studied, found at least some conflict between their roles as students and as athletes, and of these, 37 percent found complete conflict between the two roles. In resolving the conflict between the roles, the data suggest that coaches, counselors, and teachers put the emphasis on the athletic role. In fact, black athletes from several Big Ten schools commented that severe punishment was meted out for missing practice, yet no real concern was exhibited when classes were missed.

In the area of academic counseling we have discovered innumerable examples of the subverting of the student role to the athletic role. In the majority of the Big Ten schools studied, the athletic departments control the counseling of the athletes and this undoubtedly contributes to the athletes' maintaining their eligibility. Typically, the black athlete is advised to enroll in the curriculum taught by athletic department personnel, such as physical education, although he may wish to pursue a curriculum in another area. But he is told that he can get the grades and remain eligible by taking these courses, while in another field it would be too difficult for him to keep up his grades and play sports at the same time. In other cases, black athletes are advised to take courses from certain professors who are sports fans and who give good grades to athletes. This advice is given without regard to whether the particular course will enable the student to progress toward meeting his degree requirements.

The area of financial support of athletes clearly shows how the student athlete is exploited by the university. A high school athlete should be recruited by a university to: *(1) enroll as a student, (2) to obtain an education, (3) to earn a degree at that university, and (4) to play a sport at that university.* The Big Ten rules allow a student to play the sport for four years. At the end of those four years, when the student's athletic eligibility has ended, the financial support for the student is also ended. It is a rare athlete who has completed the educational requirements for a degree in that same four-year period. Indeed, it is not the norm for any male student, athlete or not, to complete his degree in four years. In a study conducted at another Big Ten university (Shapiro, 1970), it was found that only 35 percent of the male students had graduated at the end of four years. That graduating class included 4.6 percent of the black athletes and 11.5 percent of the white athletes who had started with that class.

Although financial aid ceases for all athletes at the completion of athletic eligibility, the situation of the black athlete in relation to obtaining a degree differs from the white athlete. The available data indicates that a smaller percentage of black athletes obtain degrees in contrast to their white counterparts. For example, Shapiro (1970) determined the differential graduation rates for blacks and whites. Of 156 letter winners in football, basketball, wrestling, and track who were freshmen at the university studied in the time period from fall term 1960 to fall term 1964, 113 were white and 43 were black. An analysis of the percentages of these athletes who had received their degrees by November 1970 showed that 82.3 percent of the white athletes and 46.5 percent of the black athletes had graduated. The typical graduation rate for males at this university seven years after entering is 55 percent. Thus, the white athletes graduate at a significantly higher rate and the black athletes graduate at a significantly lower rate than the university average. In addition, this study showed that of the athletes who do graduate, it takes the white athlete an average of 15 terms to complete his degree. It takes the black athlete an average of 16.4 terms.

Nowak (1968) studied a sample of black football players at still another Big Ten university who had been given tenders between the years 1951 and 1968. Of those that could have graduated in four years, only 33.3 percent actually did graduate, and only 53 percent graduated in four or more years. Nowak cited other studies to show that the low graduation rate of black athletes is not limited solely to Big Ten universities. He also reported low graduation rates for black athletes at several western universities.

There are many reasons for the low graduation rate of black athletes. We believe that a prime reason is the low expectations of academic ability shown the black athletes by their white coaches, professors, and fellow students. Whether or not these significant others do in fact have low expectations of the academic prowess of black athletes is not the point, although our experience tells us that this is indeed true. The important point is that the black athlete perceives that others have a low expectation of his academic ability. This results in a self-fulfilling prophecy. For a fuller discussion of this point see Brookover and Erickson, 1969; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1966; Rosenthal and Jacobson, 1968; Brookover, et al., 1967; Green, 1969; Gunnings, 1971.

The emphasis of the coaching staff on remaining eligible without a similar emphasis on obtaining a degree, as reported by Johnson (1972), undoubtedly contributes to the low graduation rate among black athletes. Since the main concern of the coaches lies with remaining eligible, they often have students take courses that will give them good grades but will not contribute to their degree requirements.

Another reason that some would give for the low graduation rates among black athletes is that they lack the ability or motivation necessary for a college education. However, the available data do not support this charge. Nowak (1968, p. 7) concluded "the low ratio of tendered athletes to those who graduate is not due to the admittance of marginal students." The black athletes who were admitted to the university who were judged as marginal according to the Big Ten Prediction Table did not have a significantly lower graduation rate than other black athletes who were regularly admitted.

If a man is accepted as a student at a university, the university has made an explicit statement to that student that it feels he has the ability to graduate. The student serves the university in his role as an athlete and the university must likewise make a commitment to the student to provide him with the necessary financial, counseling, and tutorial services needed to obtain his bachelor's degree. If the universi does not believe that a given student has the capabilities of achieving hi degree, it is exploitation in its most virulent form to admit the student, use his athletic ability, and then discard him. The responsibility for the shockingly low graduation rate among black athletes at Big Ten universiti lies directly at the door of each of the universities.

## Discrimination in Employment

Some of the most glaring examples of racial discrimination in Big Ten athletics occur in the area of employment. The Big Ten universiti currently employ 40 officials in football and 36 officials in basketball. Of these, only two--one in football and one in basketball--are black. Only 2.6 percent of the officials in Big Ten football and basketball are black, yet black athletes constitute from 30 to 60 percent of the players in these sports. It is clear that the "closed club" has operated to selectively keep out black officials. Certainly, the argument cannot be used that there are no blacks who are qualified to officiate athletic events. (See Appendix B for the names of several black with experience who are interested in officiating.)

The appaling lack of black officials at Big Ten athletic events is only exceeded by the lack of black employees in Big Ten athletic departments. At the seven universities surveyed we found:

*(a) no black clerical employees*

*(b) no black secretaries*

*(c) no black publicity directors*

*(d) no black team physicians*

*(e) no blacks employed in any other capacity by the athletic departments except for a few black custodians and two black trainers, and only a few black assistant or freshman coaches.*

The failure to employ blacks extends far beyond the lack of officials. For example, our research has turned up only two token black scorekeepers and timers throughout the Big Ten universities.

We were able to gather data on the Board of Directors of athletics or its equivalent at seven of the Big Ten universities. Of these seven boards, which are made up of 51 members, only four had any black representatives. At one of the four, the two black members were appointed after the disturbance at the Minnesota-Ohio State game. Excluding these two, blacks composed only 3.9 percent of the Boards of Directors of athletics at the Big Ten schools studied.

In eight Big Ten schools, only one black was found in an assistant athletic director role. No other blacks were found in any other administrative or managerial position. Of those coaching staffs which were found to have black representation, the black coaches were all assistant or freshman coaches. Many of these coaches stated that their roles and responsibilities were not clearly defined and that they were not given full coaching responsibilities. This was complicated by the fact that black assistant coaches typically did not have budget accessibility. In addition, these coaches felt that their major role was to recruit black athletes, many of whom they had no control over once they were officially enrolled in the university.

Reflecting on the above information, the staff at every level in athletic departments throughout the Big Ten is essentially all white. This data conclusively indicates that employment segregation in the Big Ten is very real.

## Discrimination Perceived by Athletes

Discussions with black athletes have uncovered informal support mechanism which exist for white athletes but which do not exist for black athletes. For example, coaches are aware of available summer employment, but often issue this information on a selective basis thereby helping white athletes to get jobs. One black athlete explained how he had gone to a large bank for a loan. He found that two of his teammates, a white quarterback and a white guard, were working for the bank vice president. The black athlete was laying asphalt for the summer.

Black athletes have also expressed concern over the fact that their wives have difficulty finding employment. Yet black athletes agree that the wives of white athletes seem to find positions within athletic departments.

Finding housing is another problem experienced by black athletes. They do not perceive white athletes as having similar difficulties.

According to the black athletes, recruiters do not portray an honest picture of what the black athlete will encounter in a predominately white university. The athletes believe that black players are purposely kept away from black recruits so they will not tell them the truth about the university and the problems that they face. Many athletes indicated that recruiters lead them to believe that they are receiving four year scholarships. However, there is no such thing as a four year athletic scholarship; all tenders are renewable on a year-to-year basis. We have also discovered that some athletes are on a term-by-term tender which we see as being drastically unfair. The athlete on a term tender is constantly unsure of his financial status.

Black athletes also commented that recruiters make them think they are going to the university to get an education and that athletics is a secondary concern. By their junior year, many feel that the reverse is actually true. Black athletes are led to believe, too, that intercollegiate athletics is the quickest road to a professional ball playing career. Yet the harsh reality of the situation is that few athletes actually make it to the pro teams.

Black athletes also expressed concern that blacks who are typically hired for coaching roles frequently end up performing menial tasks, serving as errand boys rather than coaches. At one Big Ten university, a black graduate assistant who was hired to coach at the freshman level was actually painting stadium benches. Black athletes perceive the Big Ten black coaches as having token roles and as not having concrete coaching functions. Several black coaches also said that they could see no future in the positions that they hold. One Big Ten assistant basketball coach indicated that he is thinking about leaving his position because he had been demoted rather than promoted.

## Recommendations

We believe that the following recommendations, if instituted, would greatly improve the status of blacks throughout the Big Ten Athletic Conference.

1. *Beginning no later than Fall 1972, we strongly recommend that blacks be hired at every officiating level in each sanctioned Big Ten athletic event, particularly in basketball and football.*

2. *A Big Ten Equal Opportunity Committee should be established. Each university should have two representatives on the committee,*

appointed by the president with the advice of the athletic director, the faculty representative, and black and white athletes. Representatives should be appointed outside of the athletic structure and one representative from each school should be black. The committee would be charged with examining the hiring policies at specific Big Ten schools. The committee would work with equal opportunity committees at each individual university to insure that each athletic department is desegregated at all levels of employment. We believe that a strong and affirmative effort on the part of each university will lead to employment for black secretaries, trainers, medical personnel, publicity personnel, custodial help, and top assistants-at every coaching level and within every athletic director's office.

3. In spring sports in which each individual school has the responsibility of identifying and selecting Big Ten officials, an affirmative action policy should be adopted now, to include black officials in these roles.

4. A fifth year plan of financial support should be instituted. As has been noted, it is rare that an athlete is able to complete his degree within the four year period of his eligibility. Without this additional assistance, black athletes often find it impossible to complete their education once eligibility has ended. It is imperative that some kind of financial commitment be made to all athletes to help support them in finishing their degrees after they have spent four years serving their university as athletes.

5. The athletic departments of each Big Ten university should post the names of each athlete who is holding a summer job, where the

*athlete is employed and how much he is earning. Each university should also post a list of jobs available for the summer through its resources.*

6. *Athletic departments should hire black counselors to counsel athletes throughout the athletic department with special emphasis on the unique needs of black athletes.*

7. *We recommend that the Big Ten hire a black associate commissioner with a major responsibility for implementing the recommendations in this report; working directly with athletic directors and faculty representatives in desegregating their own universities; and working directly with the Equal Opportunity Committee. His role should be a significant one.*

## Summary

The most glaring fallacy about intercollegiate athletic competition in the United States is the assumption that fairness is inherent. Indeed, as is clearly demonstrated above, college sports is not the haven of fair play and equal opportunity that we have been led to believe. To black athletes, coaches, and officials, fairness and equal opportunity are myths. The patterns of racial discrimination, both overt and covert, institutional and individual, found in the larger society are reflected in and perpetuated by athletics in the United States.

In this report we have presented data to support our contention that the employment of blacks in the Big Ten is virtually non-existent at every level. The staffs of athletic departments throughout the Big Ten are primarily all white. This is compounded by the lack of black officials, timers, and scorekeepers in the Big Ten.

Faculty representatives, athletic directors, and university presidents each must make a commitment to examine the policies of their respective schools as they relate to the employment of blacks. It is of utmost importance that the Big Ten Athletic Conference develop strategies to employ blacks and put an end to racial discrimination in hiring in the Big Ten.

In addition, we have documented the unequal treatment and exploitation that black athletes receive in the areas of education, academic advising, and counseling. The problems that black athletes face in trying to attain a degree can be alleviated by providing them with responsible academic counseling and adequate financial resources. This will go far toward relieving their anxiety regarding both their academic and financial status.

In conclusion, many would argue that college athletics has afforded the black man opportunities he would not otherwise have had. While it is true that intercollegiate athletics has been a stepping stone to success for a very few, there is grave danger in focusing on these few and ignoring the vast majority. As this report has indicated, Big Ten intercollegiate athletics has failed to provide the majority of black athletes with even an education. Beyond this it appears that black athletes draw spectators and white athletic departments get the monetary gains. These departments fail to provide employment, staff, or administrative positions to either former black athletes or members of the black community at large. This contrasts markedly with the opportunities afforded both former white athletes and member of the white community.

We would very much like to have an interim report from the Joint Group of Faculty Representatives and Athletic Directors submitted by the Big Ten Commissioner focusing on the issues we have raised in this report. We would like to have this report prior to the scheduled May 22-24 meeting.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brookover, W.B. and Erickson, E.L. Society, Schools and Learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Brookover, W.B., Erickson, E.L., and Joiner, L. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement, III. Report of the Cooperative Research Project 2831, Bureau of Publication Services. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1967.

Green, Robert L. The Urban School Child. In R.L. Green (Ed), Racial Crisis in American Education. Chicago: Follett Educational Corp., 1969.

Gunnings, Thomas S. Preparing the New Counselor. The Counseling Psychologist, Vol. 2, No. 4, 1971.

Johnson, L.T.B. The Interaction of Soul, Mind, and Body: A Study of the Role Compatibility, Role Conflict, and Role Resolution of Black Student Athletes on a Predominantly White University Campus. Unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, 1972.

Nowak, W.S. Black Athlete under Tender: An Investigation of the Sociological Background of the Negro Football Player at a Midwest University. Unpublished senior honor's thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, 1968.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Teachers' Expectancies: Determinants of Pupils' IQ Gains. Psychological Reports, 19, 1966.

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

Shapiro, B.J. The Black Athlete at Michigan State University. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1970.

## THE "JOCK-TRAP"--HOW THE BLACK ATHLETE GETS CAUGHT![1]

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.

"Another aspect of the 'jock-trap,' and probably the most tragic, is the fact that so many Black athletes simply do not get the education that they are entitled to, either in high school or in college, while they are being lionized as athletic figures. The athletic system as it is presently conducted in our major high schools and major colleges, tends to victimize the Black athlete in terms of his education. All athletes, Black, white and brown deserve the opportunity to get a good education, an opportunity which is being denied to them because of the way the athletic system works. It is well known that requirements for academic achievement and performance are not generally as high for athletes in most high schools and colleges where athletics are employed. In many of the 'athletic factories' the athlete on scholarship usually takes only a twelve point load. (We should note that it takes a fifteen point load each term to get a degree in four years.) While some athletes go back to get their degrees after the fourth year, in far too many places there is no financial aid for tuition and maintenance to support athletes after they have completed their years of eligibility. In some instances, athletic eligibility requirements are based on a grade point index which is low enough so that even if an athlete finishes in four years, he may not have a sufficient grade point average to graduate.

---

[1] Quoted in part from a speech delivered at the Maryland State Association of Health, Physical Education and Recreation Meeting, October 19, 1972.

Why does this affect the Black athlete so strongly? The Black athlete frequently comes to the school situation with a poor academic background (a fact that is definitely not his fault but rather is the fault of the social system which creates and operates poor schools in our inner cities) and must have extra academic help in order to do college work. The suggestion that Black youth are not as intelligent as white youth is a rationalization that has been disproved years ago. There is no rationalization that can account for the fact that half as many Black athletes graduate as white athletes. The 'jock-trap' in education for the Black athlete is not only a function of the limited number of points that athletes are allowed to take, but is also a function of the low expectations of the Black athlete by coaching staffs, by other students, by their professors and even, by some of their fellow Black athletes. Two or three studies have been completed which have shown that the Black athlete often internalize some of the low expectations of his coaches and his teachers. These low expectations must be purged from the minds of the Black athletes, purged from the minds of the coaches and purged from the minds of his fellow students. The way to do this of course is to set expectations that are high, achievable yes--but high nonetheless. This requires tutoring and counseling; it also requires giving the athlete the time to do the extra studying and the extra work that is necessary for him to get through school. To make all-American is laudible, but does not insure success in life, but to make all-American and to graduate is to more or less insure an athlete's success in the future. We should remember that only 132 out of the one thousand odd football players that were drafted last year made it to the pros (and the one thousand that were drafted represents only the cream of all of those who played). The athlete's quest for the million dollar bonus contract does not justify the poor education that the average athlete receives. The main reason for the existence for a college athletic program is the development of the intellectual, social and emotional potential of the athlete of the team members of the social system in which he lives. The athlete is not a 'gladiator' and should be treated as such.

What is my remedy for the 'jock-trap?' The remedy which I propose is said by some to be too radical and too infeasible. Recognizing that there might be some legitimate criticisms to the remedy I still would like to propose it again. Namely that major college athletics namely basketball, football, track, baseball or whatever the major sport creates the pressures described above should become professional. By professional I mean that the college athlete should be paid a salary commensurate with his work as a professional athlete, just as a student who is a secretary or a librarian is paid. I am not prepared at this point to give the exact amount the athlete should be paid, but it should be substantial; a salary that will enable him to support a family and to live in a reasonably adequate style during the four years as a paid college athlete. I would limit his professional status to the usual four years of college eligibility. He may, if he desires, attend college and get an education (with the tuition paid by the institution for which he is participating). I would not require that he attend college because it is the requirement that the athlete be a student that leads to athletes taking easy courses and limiting their programs to twelve points. The four years during which the athlete participates at the college level would be viewed as a kind of minor league, pre-professional training. It's true that some may leave the college before their four years are completed but this happens now when athletes sign contracts while they're still called 'amateurs.' My proposed remedy would have two effects, (1) it would eliminate the hypocrisy that presently surrounds modern day college athletics and (2) it would probably bring to the athlete's attention the real value of the schooling that he is supposed to get when he is on an athletic scholarship, but tends to take somewhat lightly because of the 'iron-hand' control of the athletic department. Under this proposal he can select the courses that he really wants to take. It might be suggested that his schedule as an athlete might be so arduous that he would never get a chance to study, but contracts could be written so that there is a limitation on the amount of time that the athlete spends in practice for the team. This program might actually be cheaper than the present cost of college athletic programs because some athletes in some of our large colleges are reputed to be taking a cut in salary when they finally go to the pro ranks, at $50,000 a year. I believe that this system would enhance the value of education in the mind of the athlete and give him the motivation and also the bargaining power, the flexibility to seek education as he desires it. The athlete will probably need counseling and would need special help, but this is true with many Black and other minority and poor youth in today's colleges. The suggestion to make college athletics professional will expose the rank injustice of many of the things that happen to the Black athlete. It will say to the Black youth, 'caveat emptor' (buyer beware) before you fall into the 'jock-trap.'

The 'jock-trap' is seductive and has had many deleterious affects on both the Black and white athlete. It is our task as educators, as physical educators, as coaches, to look at the 'jock-trap' and determine various ways of avoiding it. Athletics must do more to fulfill the objective of making a healthier, happier, more vigorous and more creative society for those who participate and for those who enjoy being associated with them."

## Appendix 6

## SAMPLE QUESTIONS FOR SURVEY ON BLACK OFFICIALS

Melvin Evans

## A SURVEY OF OFFICIALS IN THE MAJOR ATHLETIC CONFERENCES IN THE UNITED STATES

1. What is the average years of experience of the officials in your conference? _____

2. What is the average age of the officials in your conference? _____

3. Are your officials classified? _____

4. If yes, please state those ratings.

5. How much are your officials paid? Give highest and lowest figures. _____ _____

6. What is the mean miles traveled by officials of your organization each year? _____

7. How many Black officials are there in your organization? _____

8. How many women officials? _____

9. Do you have training schools or clinics for your officials? _____

10. Please list the slate of officers in your organization - i.e., President, Secretary, etc.

    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.

11. Please enclose a copy of the system used in assigning officials to games.

12. How many games does your organization assign each year? Include football and basketball. _____ _____

13. Do your officials have any fringe benefits? If yes, name some.

14. How much input does your organization have in making game rules' changes? Circle one - A great deal - Some - None

15. What is the mean education of your officials? _____

16. What percentage of your officials played in college the sport which he now officiates? _____

## INTERVIEW QUESTIONS CONCERNING BLACK COACHES AT PREDOMINATELY WHITE INSTITUTIONS

Melvin Evans

1. Why did you (Black coach) accept a position at a predominately white school?

2. How do you see your role in the overall scheme of the athletic program?

3. Name your specific responsibilities as an assistant coach.

4. Name the responsibilities of another assistant coach whose responsibilities are similar to yours.

5. How are you viewed by Black athletes?

6. How are you viewed by white athletes?

7. Do you feel that you have the respect of the white athletes?

8. Do you feel that you have the respect of the Black athletes?

9. Do you feel that you have the respect of the head coach?

10. Do you feel that you have the respect of the other assistant coach?

11. What is your salary? _____

12. Does your salary come from the same sources as the other coaches?

13. Is your salary comparable to other assistance coaches who have similar responsibilities?

14. How were you recruited?

15. Are you presently pursuing a degree at this institution?

16. When will you complete this degree?

17. Do you intend to remain here after the completion of your degree?

18. If you leave here, with what kind of institution would you want to be associated?

## SUGGESTED QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SURVEY OF ATHLETICS IN THE BLACK COLLEGES

C. D. Henry

### Recruiting and Admission

1. Has desegregation affected your efforts in recruiting athletes? Yes_____ No_____

2. If yes, how? ______________________________________

   If not, why not? ______________________________________

   Do you have special programs for admitting students who fail to meet normal entrance requirements? Yes_____ No_____

   Open for State_______________

   Comments:

3. Do athletes represent a disproportionate per cent of these students? _____

4. Do you have special admission requirements for out-of-state students? _____

5. Do junior colleges and/or community colleges affect your enrollment? _____

### Financial Aid

6. How is your athletic program financed? State subsidy, alumni gifts, student fees, booster clubs, others?

   Comments:

7. Can your school live with the current table? Could it live with the 72 proposed table? What minimums could you live with?

| | CURRENT QUOTA | PROPOSED | MINIMUM |
|---|---|---|---|
| Baseball | 6+13 = 19 | 4+ 9 = 13 | |
| *Basketball | 6+12 = 18 | 4+10 = 14 | |
| Cross Country Track | 7+16 = 23 | 5+11 = 16 | |
| *Football | 30+75 =105 | 20+45 = 65 | |
| Golf | 3+ 5 = 8 | 2+ 4 = 6 | |
| Swimming | 6+13 = 19 | 4+ 9 = 13 | |
| Tennis | 3+ 5 = 8 | 2+ 4 = 6 | |
| Wrestling | 6+13 = 19 | 4+ 9 = 13 | |

Note: New scholarships on left, squad on right and then total scholarships

*Income producing

### Tutoring

8. Do you provide books for athletes? Yes_____ No_____

Does the University/College? Yes_____ No_____ and/or the athletic department? Yes_____ No_____ supply tutors for athletes if desired?

### Counseling

9. Is personal counseling available for student-athletes other than that available for other students? Yes_____ No_____

10. Is academic counseling available for student-athletes other than that provided for other students? Yes_____ No_____

11. What area, department, discipline has the greatest number of majors on your campus?

### Employment

12. Are most of your players graduating and available for employment after 4 yrs., 4½ yrs., 5 yrs., yes, no? Please circle

13. Does the college and/or the athletic department aid wives of players to find employment?

Comment:

## National Organizations

14. What relations with NCAA would you like to see changed?

transfer rule_____; 2.0 _____; 1.6 reinstated_____;
red-shirting_____; redistricting_____; others_____

15. What relations with NAIA would you like to see changed?

transfer rule_____; 24 hour rule_____; redistricting_____;
Jury-judge power of Executive Committee_____; Others_____

16. LIST ANYTHING THAT WOULD AID TREATMENT OF THE BLACK ATHLETE AT ANY LEVEL.

Appendix 8

# RACE, SPORT AND THE NEWS MEDIA[*]

Roscoe C. Brown, Jr.
Director, Institute of Afro-American Affairs
New York University

The status of the Black athlete is the most exciting, provocative and controversial topic on today's sports pages and radio and television sportscasts. The thesis that I shall present today is that the news media, wittingly or unwittingly, have helped to create a series of myths about the Black athlete--myths, which when disseminated in the media, cause considerable anguish to the Black athlete and to the Black community. It is my position that the news media should become more aware of its role in perpetuating these myths and take active steps to correct them. The concept of a free press is one that not only requires freedom of reporting but also implies social responsibility in presenting the facts as accurately as possible in a context which appropriately reflects the phenomenon being considered.

What are the concerns that the Black athlete and the Black community have about the news media and sports? First, there is the continuous presentation of the Black athlete as a superstar. Unfortunately, the news media in focusing on the fantastic accomplishments of Black athletes in football, basketball, baseball and track and field have tended to ignore that the Black athlete is not always a superstar. The emphasis by the news media on the role of the Black athlete as a superstar has made it easy to overlook the discrimination against the average Black athlete. This is particularly true in the phenomenon known as "stacking," in which Black athletes are made to compete against each other for the same positions. This is usually done in order to keep a "racial balance" on a team. This behavior on the part of coaches and managers is a pure distortion of the basic ideal of sport in society, namely the best man or woman participates regardless of his race, ethnic background, or economic status. The news media often fail to report this type of discrimination. One possible reason for this is that so many newspaper and radio-television reporters cover the same team day after day and week after week (some television reporters are even hired by the teams they cover): hence, some of them are not as faithful to the truth as they should be. While I recognize the very sensitive position of a reporter who covers a team day after day, I submit that the main responsibility of a sports reporter is to the reader in presenting as many of the facts as accurately as possible so that the fans can make their own judgements.

---

[*] Presented at the Symposium on Sports Sociology at Queens College, March 10, 1972.

A second myth that is perpetuated by the sports news media is the myth of the "satisfaction" of the Black athlete with his condition.

Some commentators suggest that the Black athlete is lucky to be where he is and therefore should be grateful and not complain. It is further suggested that the fact that some Black athletes can sign contracts for over $100,000 indicates that the grinding poverty and the oppression of racism is not as great as it actually is. Again, the news media have a responsibility, particularly in the editorial columns, of exposing the hypocrisy of such a position. As situations such as the Jim McDaniel's case and the Jimmy Chones' case come to the public's attention, more sports writers are writing about the hypocrisy which they knew about before but were fearful of expressing. Part of the reason for the media's failure to reveal the hypocrisy in sports could be the fact that sports are considered to be a palliative in America or an escape; therefore, the social problems that are reflected in sports on the playing fields and in the gymnasia should not be reflected on the sports page. This is the kind of thinking that once prevailed in the arts in America and is at last being wiped away with every great play or literary work which speak of the various inconsistencies in our society. The news media have an ethical responsibility to deal with these inconsistencies as reflected in sport. This is part of the news media's responsibility as a part of a free press in a free society.

Third, in not providing coverage of sports events and sports activities in the Black community or in Black institutions, high schools or colleges, the news media have failed to show the effective sports programs in Black institutions. An example of this is the limited coverage given to many of the Black athletes coming out of the predominately Black colleges and high schools in the South. While it might be suggested that coverage of sport activities in Black colleges is not consistent with coverage of news on the national scope, the fact that so many of the participants of professional sports come from predominately Black situations suggests that more coverage should be given to Black athletes in predominately Black high schools and colleges. Since many Black athletes attain their achievements under the hardships of lack of adequate physical facilities and lack of money, the news media could do a real service to the Black community by not only highlighting the exploits of these athletes but also describing the difficult conditions in which they live, study and work in order to attain the heights that they have reached. In a sense, the media will be educating the larger society about the nature and scope of racism in limiting educational opportunities for Blacks and how Blacks are striving to achieve despite such handicaps.

And finally, one of my greatest criticisms of the news media is the way in which the media have tended to exclude Blacks and other non-white minorities from reporting and announcing. It is ironic that in a field where Blacks occupy such a prominent place, such as sports, that there are so few Black sports reporters on the major dailies and even fewer Black sports reporters on radio and television. While it is true that a few Black professional stars, such as Bill Russell on ABC Basketball Game of the Week, have had an opportunity to do between play commentary, there have been practically no opportunities given to Black announcers to do the play-by-play commentary which is so important in radio and television coverage of sports, and is also so financially rewarding. This lack suggests that in addition to dealing with the way in which it covers the Black in sport, the media must do a great deal of soul-searching in order to try to fulfill its role in reporting the multi-ethnic and multi-racial world of sport.

The sports pages have been replete for generations with statements extolling the role of sport as a equalizer and a democratizing agent in society. I maintain that the news media have not contributed nearly as much as they could to the development of a broader public appreciation of both the accomplishments and the problems of the Black athlete. In order to do this, it will be necessary for the news media to not only improve the quality of its coverage and reporting, but to increase dramatically the representation of Blacks and other non-whites in its various reportorial and executive capacities. I believe that the news media and the world of sport must meet this challenge because the challenge is clear, the challenge is right and the time is now!!

APPENDIX E

# SPORTS AND THE POST-SECONDARY SECTOR

by

Joseph Froomkin

February 28, 1974

JOSEPH FROOMKIN INC.
1015 Eighteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

JOSEPH FROOMKIN INC.
1015 EIGHTEENTH STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE 202
833-2220

# SPORTS AND THE POST-SECONDARY SECTOR

## Introduction

In the 1920's, a Carnegie-sponsored report on the place of sports in college bitingly attacked the emphasis on intercollegiate competition, citing abuses in the recruitment of athletes as well as the unfairness and underhandedness with which some athletes were compensated. Today, a much more biting report could be written about conditions in inter-collegiate sports.

If anything, the warts on the face of sports described in the Carnegie report have grown. Colleges and universities now spend larger sums than ever before on the financing of spectacles. Since the 1920's, sports spectaculars sponsored by post-secondary institutions have become more extensive; they are no longer confined to football, as basketball and selected track and field events have started to attract increasingly large audiences.

The moral indignation which members of the Carnegie group exercised about subsidies for athletes did not stop the practice. On the contrary, the practice of giving subsidies has spread and is now in the open, as athletic scholarships are available for major sports athletes in most schools that have large teams. The sham and pretense of make-work jobs such as waiting at table or dispensing gym towels have been abandoned, and subsidies to athletes have been openly institutionalized. Possibly as our society becomes more affluent we can no longer channel sufficient amounts of money in devious ways, and must resort increasingly to instituitionalized transfers.

It will be argued below that the relationship between the expectations of athletes and the growing affluence of the economy must be reexamined. Unlike King Canute who attempted to stem the tide, the platoon of wise men chosen to review sports policy in the post-secondary sector must take into account the realities which have nurtured the devotion to spectaculars in collegiate sports, as well as the rightful place of physical conditioning in the post-secondary sector.

Some of the observations of the early Carnegie report should be remembered in that connection. The report noted that the emphasis on inter-collegiate competition came about as a result of the inability of post-secondary institutions to excel in academic pursuits. Their prognosis that academic excellence was likely to result in a de-emphasis on sports spectaculars has certainly proved true in the case of selected Ivy-league schools.

At the same time, a realistic appraisal of the consequences of the U.S. commitment to mass post-secondary education precludes the expectation that a vast majority of institutions are likely to achieve the lofty standards of academic excellence which will make it reasonable for them to de-emphasize sports activity. Most theories of organization have emphasized the necessity of a common cause to bind an organization together. The inter-collegiate team is often considered a suitable means of achieving this cohesion.

The analysis of collegiate sports is complicated by the uniqueness of the American way of life. In the first place, the great emphasis on winning, in contrast to just participating in sports activities, has placed special pressures and rewards on managers and participants of college athletics. The emphasis on championship in a particular league, or at a particular meet, the additional exposure (and indirect benefits to sponsoring institutions) afforded to the champions, either in the form of post-season games or invitations to additional meets, puts tremendous pressures on trainers. Outside of Eastern European countries, and possibly Germany, which, in sports, still carries the legacy of the thousand-year Reich, the United States is the only country with a large cadre of professional coaches for all sports in the employ of post-secondary institutions. The professionalization of college sports coaching makes it extremely difficult to integrate our college athletic managers into the amateur-dominated Olympic Committee.

The will to win, to assert ourselves over all opponents, has prompted us to attempt to excel in all sports, try to win Olympic competitions, and sponsor bi-national competitions.

U.S. participation in both the Olympics and international competitions is complicated by the fact that we have a cadre of professional coaches, like those of totaltarian governments, combined with a loose democratic federal structure which does not allow us to disguise them. Olympic organizations may thus have serious reservations about transferring franchises for international competitions to college-based, coach-dominated organizations. It is far too optimistic to expect that gracious cooperation between organizations with international franchises and those dominated by college coaches will take place in the future either. Hence, there is a feeling, at least on Capitol Hill, that new organizations must be invented, around which sports could be organized.

The interests of athletes have been much discussed, but never actually analyzed. Undoubtably, these differ from sport to sport. For football and basketball players, a professional career may be in store; however, they may not crave international recognition. For other star athletes, who are unlikely to "clean up" through professional sports, a place on the United States team, or a medal, may be more important than participation in extra-mural games.

The discussion below attempts to contribute to a realistic evaluation of the role of sports in post-secondary education. In other words, it takes as its point of departure the current state of affairs in post-secondary sports, and suggests topics for investigation which may improve the functioning of sports to benefit the majority of participants in the post-secondary sector. In any such analysis, the limitations of reform must be addressed realistically, and the self-interest of institutions and different publics recognized. It may be equally important to identify new interest groups that may raise louder voices about the shortcomings of the present system and demand "pieces of the action" in the future.

The complexity of any analysis of post-secondary sports cannot be underestimated. In the first place, a distinction must be made between sports where some revenue can be derived either from ticket sales or video rights. Second, a non-parallel distinction must be made between inter-collegiate, or closed, competition, and those in which all amateur athletes can participate, the so-called open meets. Third, the target groups benefiting from different sports activities must be distinguished. Among the post-secondary population, the interests of those with a major commitment to excelling in a sport must be looked at differently from occasional participants in sports. The often ignored, but extremely important interests of the strata of professional employees of post-secondary institutions whose job is to manage sports must be investigated. In addition to these two groups, which participate in/or manage the sports activity, the role of the audiences must be examined. In the case of inter-collegiate competition, alumni, state legislators and students are the more obvious interest groups. The roles of commercial networks and professional associations of players are probably equally important, but less easy to document, and have often been ignored.

In the case of international contests, there exists considerable confusion about the different roles of competing sports associations. The national intersts of the United States, which are becoming increasingly the concern of both houses on Capitol Hill, need to be analyzed.

There is little doubt that much of the orientation of post-secondary sports is sordid. After some reading about the regulators of the sports, I have little doubt that the various groups engaged in promoting competition should have their motives, as well as their modus operandi, analyzed. One hardly knows where to start in suggesting an unravelling of the complex cocoon of post-secondary sports.

## Varying Publics in Post-Secondary Sports

Post-secondary sports activities encompass a variety of disparate endeavours. They cover the spectrum of individual physical conditioning activities, intra-mural sports, team sports, and spectator sports. Not only does each one of these activities have a different economic profile -- a profile which may even differ for an identical sport, institution by institution -- but in some cases, the participants and beneficiaries of the activity may be limited to the participant/sportsman, and in others they may encompass groups other than players.

To complicate matters further, the purposes of the sports activities have never been clearly defined, with defenders of sports activities hiding behind cliches, some of them dating from Roman times (e.g. "a sound mind in a sound body," or "mass sports are morale-building"). Recent examinations of the place of sports in American life have emphasized the surrogate father-figure of modern industrial society. There may be more truth about the function of spectator sports in the 1950's in part of Clark Kerr's quip that the function of the multi-university was to provide "parking for the faculty, sex for the students, and football for the alumni."

The uses of the continuum of sports activities in post-secondar institutions need to be classified much more carefully, with the realization that the uses under each of these headings may change quite drastically in different periods of time. Unless one realizes that some of these uses evolve, just as the post-secondary system evolves, a policy designed to rationalize the behaviour of sports in post-secondary institutions may not remain viable for long.

Physical conditioning and intra-mural sports. The most clear-cut use of post-secondary sports, that of a physical conditioning activity for participants, is the least controversial, least emphasized, and least measured. Even in schools with strong intra-mural programs, such as the University of Chicago, and magnificent facilities for individual conditioning (through swimming, running, weight lifting, etc.), sports programs are popular mostly in on-campus residences. One gets the feeling that the programs are designed to allow the young to spend their animal spirits on the field rather than in the destruction of institutional property.

Participation in intra-mural sports is one of the least known and least measured activities in America. The University of Oklahoma mentions in its catalogue that 90 per cent of the students participate in intra-mural sports, for instance, but, in all probability this figure was derived by dividing the total number of participants in intra[illegible]al sports by the number of students, and ignoring the double-counting. Most schools list only the available sports for students in their catalogues, and do not offer estimates on participation.

Besides some elemental requirements in physical education for undergraduates, increasingly waved for veterans and members of school bands, the sports departments in post-secondary institutions are most devoted to (1) handling organized spectator sports, and

(2) assisting in the organization of team activities on requests from interested groups.

The statistics about the poor physical condition of a large segment of American youths have generally not resulted in the development of remedial programs of sports for the physically disadvantaged. In a few institutions, such as the University of Minnesota, separate sport programs are offered for stars, for those in superior, average, and bad physical condition. The Minnesota program is exceptional. The battle against cardiac arrest has not been joined by most institutions in the post-secondary sector.

Nor have the post-secondary institutions recast their sports programs to cater to the potentially upwardly mobile, increasingly affluent society in which we live. Most sports programs offered to the students are extensions or watered-down versions of less strenuou sports available in high school. Soccer and volleyball for men, and badminton or field hockey for women, are still the most often mention intra-mural sports in catalogues.

It would be important to determine to what extent training for sports favored by the more affluent are offered in college: tennis, golf, and, with the proliferation of individual or development pool facilities, swimming. The role of post-secondary institutions in training intelligent consumers of available sports facilities has not been highlighted in most post-secondary institutions.

One certainly gets the impression that the changes in social structure of the past two decades are not being reflected in offerings to occasional participants in sports in post-secondary institutions. It is this confusion that is probably causing much of the problem with sports for women. Of the meager, episodic offerings in non-spectator sports, women are probably getting their fair share, but it is a share of a thoroughly irrelevant pile. For instance at Baylor University, a school not famed for attention to the occasional participant, the leading middle-class sport of tennis is not listed as an intra-mural activity, nor are women offered the following programs available to men: basketball, soccer, horseshoes, or snooker (incidently, billiards are offered to both men and women).

On an average campus, women are less likely to volunteer or be recruited for intra-mural sports programs. In a way, this has caused the vicious circle of low demand and little staff. As long as sports in college are focused on team competition, rather than individual participation, their relevance to the vast majority of women, as well as a large number of men, is likely to be marginal.

After perusing numerous catalogues and talking to half a dozen university administrators, I was left with the impression that sport's contribution to the way of life of the post-secondary student, after he graduated, was thoroughly ignored. In a society that is increasingly poor in primary commodities, bedevilled by concerns for ecology and conservation of energy, and characterized by slower-growing real incomes, there has been little thought to the channelling of leisure-tim activities to sports in adult life and away from gardening, maintenance of second homes, boats and snow-mobiles. The development of patterns of physical conservation of resources among participants in post-secondary education consonant with the living patterns in the future remains to be seriously discussed.

Spectator sports. Spectator sports, with football and basketbal being the most popular, are the image-makers in the post-secondary sector. A number of academically lackluster institutions, notably Ohio State, U.S.C., Alabama, Texas, Colorado or Louisiana State, have gained national prominence through their prowess on the gridiron "Basketball" schools, such as North Carolina State, Loyola, Long Island University or San Jose State are also known coast-to-coast.

The uses of a spectator sport to cement a school spirit have been commented upon at length. A winning team contributes to school cohesion, to cementing alumni support, or to ensuring sympathetic consideration of the institution's budget in the state legislature. The extent to which these goals are reached is not clear.

For instance, prominent football and basketball schools were less likely to have major student disorders compared to those with either less prominent teams, or less successful emphasis on spectato sports. It is not clear, though, whether either the success of team or the emphasis on the sports program was responsible for a docile student body. It is quite possible that fewer deviant students are attracted to schools with a great deal of emphasis on spectator sports.

Whether alumni support schools more enthusiastically when the school has an important spectator sports program, and decrease their support to schools with less athletic emphasis, is also a moot point. It is important to distinguish, in that connection, whether alumni who support sports-minded schools support general educational endeavours more generously than the average, or whether they channel their formal support to spectator-sport-oriented projects. I believe that this is a peripheral matter since most schools obtain only a very small part of their support from alumni. A dissenting view, by a Stanford alumnus, is that the contributions to the school vary with the fortune of the football team.

Much more interesting is the determination of the effect of spectator sport emphasis and/or success upon decisions of state legislatures to finance a higher level of outlay per student for non-spectator sports purposes, or the expansion of enrollment in those schools that are heavily oriented to spectator sports. At least in Texas, the legislature has often been reminded of the need to have a university worthy of its football team. A statistical study along these lines may be enlightening.

From a broader viewpoint, spectator sports have two additional functions: (1) They may well provide a training ground for consumer-spectators for the rest of their adult lives, and (2) They are training grounds for professional athletes in these sports.

The increasing popularity of basketball and football as spectator sports has never been convincingly linked to the fact that a growing number of persons in our population who have attended or graduated from post-secondary institutions have had an increased exposure to these two sports. This hypothesis is extremely attractive, though. While baseball, a sport seldom emphasized in inter-collegiate competition, is waning in popularity, both attendance and viewership of football and basketball have skyrocketed. It may well be argued that the attendance and popularity of spectator sports are linked increasingly to their association with a higher way of life, the post-secondary experience, even if they appeal to individuals who have never been to college.

If this hypothesis is correct, an increasing proportion of the post-secondary population may wish to familiarize itself with these sports. There may be pressure for more, rather than less, football and basketball in post-secondary institutions. In turn, the increased popularity of the sport may escalate the demand for players both at the college and professional level.

For the average varsity player, especially one from a family with modest means, participation in a spectator sport may be a convenient way of meeting the costs of college attendance. For the potential star, who expects to "clean up" as a professional, a college-playing career is a considerable investment. The right coach, a highly visible team and a bit of luck (or pluck) may determine success in the professional league. It is precisely in this connection that a diversity of views manifests itself about the relationship of the star athlete and the school.

What is the measure of fealty owed by the athlete to the school for providing a showcase for physical prowess? To what extent does the school owe him a responsibility for developing this prowess to the fullest measure? What happens to, say, a football player whose forte is passing, if the coach prefers a slower-moving game? Also, it is not at all clear how much stars are trained during their college careers, or whether they merely gain experience, or perhaps are merely given a chance to exhibit their potential.

In the case of athletes in spectator sports, a further responsibility of the institution must be raised: that of training the athletes for jobs other than in professional sports during their period of eligibility. If they fail to graduate during their elegibility period, because of rigorous training requirements, does the institution have a responsibility for further support during their academic career? A host of similar questions will be raised in connection with the economic and human investment decisions raised by various types of sports activities.

Team, individual sports and the national interest. Television viewers were treated during 1973 to a rerun of films from the Berlin Olympics of 1936. Probably at no time before, and probably at no time since, have national passions been so excited by sports events. (In the original Olympics, in Greece, the individual athletes were honored, not the city-state they represented.) Nevertheless, to this day, the counting of points for gold, silver and bronze medals awarded to sportsmen of different nations continues. In the past decade, as the proficiency of Soviet women athletes became extremely pronounced, U.S. performance in Olympic sports has become an increasing concern to a significant minority of opinion-makers and politicians.

With the possible exception of basketball, no major U.S. spectator sport is represented in the Olympics. A large number of individual and team sports are e.g. track, swimming, boating, skiing, soccer, etc. None of these sports can be expected to attract a big gate or following in the United States. They are sponsored by selected schools, and are generally supported by local enthusiasts. For instance, Mountain and Northern Plains schools sponsor hockey teams, Hawaii schools excel in swimming, and a number of California schools do well in track.

There is little question, though, that there is much star talent loss in these fields due to the uneven coaching standards which prevail from one school to another. The United States, unlike the

Soviet Union, does not keep a close watch on talent. It does not sponsor subsidized state, regional and national meets, nor direct talented athletes to settings where they can get the best training.

It is not at all obvious that the development of star athletes in non-spectator sports can be easily left to colleges, and that alternative arrangements may not be more efficient.

## Sports in a Free-Enterprise Economy

Our anachronistic belief that a government which governs least governs best is still fondly held in that enclave of conservatives, the world of sports. It is sacrocanct despite the fact that states make direct appropriations to defray part of the cost of spectator sports, and states guarantee outlays for expensive sports facilities.

There is little doubt that major spectator sports are very expensive. The football budget of a big school like the University of Colorado is roughly $2 million, nearly $100 per student. The University of Texas spends $1.8 million on football, or roughly $120 per student. True, these expenditures are more illusory than real, since both teams have a large enough following for the universities to break even on their outlays from gate receipts of home games.

Mencken once mentioned that the formula of success in post-secondary education was to find a good location for a football stadium and build a school around it. Most schools which have successful football teams either are located in large metropolitan areas and draw heavily from them, or (like the University of Alabama) play part of their home games in a metropolitan area. Climate is as important as the location. In the North-East and in the North of the Great Plains, the alternative of watching a football game in front of a warm television set affects attendance. Also important is a resevoir of fans, generally alumni, who will attend games in on years, as well as off years.

As football, and to some lesser degree basketball, requires a major investment in plant, promotion and recruiting, a large number of smaller schools has dropped out of the limelight, leaving the field to public schools with mammoth enrollments and large battalions of alumni. The only private schools in major football competition are U.S.C., favored by metropolitan location and climate, Notre Dame, a school fortunate enough to enlist every non-college football fan as its honorary alumnus, and Stanford, a fluke produced by sun, large real estate holding and fanatic alumni. The rest of the contenders for the football crowns, or post-season games, are generally large state schools.

It may be important to reverse this trend. Especially if spectator sports become an important factor in attracting students, an effort will have to be made to regulate the competition for potential star athletes. Setting this objective is easier than implementing it. The ceilings placed on the number of athletic scholarships, currently set as no more than 130 per football team, are one way of doing it. Unfortunately the number of scholarships accentuates another serious problem: the expenses of recruiting, and the possible under-the-table payments to star athletes. Both of these "unethical activities" are financed outside of the post-secondary budget, usually by alumni boosters.

When one has to deal with a situation over which the formal controls break down, it is extremely important to look at both the intended and unintended consequences of regulations. For instance, on the surface, the regulation on the number of athletic scholarships makes it possible to equalize compeitition between large and small schools. But one of the unintended consequences of the lowering of the number of permissible athletic scholarships (at one time they were 200 per football team, and this number was subsequently lowered to 130) is to put a premium on recruiting. Every possible scholarship has to be given to the most promising player.

Athletes may suffer rather than benefit from this pressure for more careful selection. Some schools, notably Texas, over-recruit, and force sub-par athletes to drop out to bring their books into balance. This process is neither fair to the athletes recruited, who are "psyched" to drop out and give up their scholarship, or to other schools who take the letter of the law more literally, and do not push their recruiting errors out of school.

A reform such as a limit on the head-count of recruited athletes could benefit athletes, but would increase recruitment malpractices. By contrast, lifting the ceiling on scholarship recipients would make it possible for large football schools to dominate spectator sports even more.

The possibility of assigning promising athletes to schools is not very realistic. No one is ready to limit the choice of schools for a given sub-strata of the high school class. This is not only a limitation on the civil rights of students, but may also be against the interest of a star athlete, who may believe that his chances of playing professional ball are improved if he is coached by the staff of a particular university. Even if football and basketball stars are paid more than the ground rules allow, they are certainly not very highly compensated, and their decisions to spend four or five years (if they are redshirted) in college playing a major sport must be considered as an investment, or speculation, for a further career.

Economic analyses of the consequences of post-secondary education abound. None of them have put the spotlight on the college player of spectator sports. There is little doubt that of all high school students either recruited or volunteering to play a spectator sport, only a small proportion make the varsity team. Of those who make the varsity, even in star teams, only a small proportion receive professional offers. Of those who receive professional offers, only a minute fraction survive two years of professional competition, and even a smaller fraction have a career of any length. A study of this sort should contribute to "truth in recruiting."

If the pay-off odds are as low as I think they are, the position of a spectator sports coach is not to be envied. He has to surround his endeavour with an aura of glamour to procure his labor force. At the same time, in a school with a major program, he is responsible for the balance-sheet of his operation. Of the roughly 300 teams in football inter-scholastic competition, it is estimated that 100 break even. In other words, one coach out of three runs a business where the income and outgo do balance. Granted that he is subsidized to some extent through cheap stadium rentals (which may or may not be charged to his budget), free labor for his band and cheering squad, some special appropriations from state legislatures, etc., he does carry, at the same time, a number of loss-leaders, the whole minor sports athletic program, and some teams with no gate appeal, such as wrestling or tennis.

The coach is thus an entrepreneur, who has to budget his resources for equipment, uniforms, maintenance, salaries, etc., while keeping his eye upon the gate and television rights. He is interested in a winning team, not only because it means a larger gate, but, in the case of the super-teams, larger television fees, and the rights to a post-season game, a play-off or a championship.

Much of the intransigence and brutality of coaches, which have been documented in memoirs of football players, are reminiscent of the behaviour of factory entrepreneurs in the 18th century. These entrepreneurs were motivated to make a profit, they dealt with a subservient, highly motivated and non-unionized labor force, and they were facing a cut-throat competition market. In today's spectator sports market, the coach is in no better position than the 18th-century entrepreneur. In order to keep his equipment and know-how (coaching staff) in tip-top shape, he has to maximize his income. He does it at the expense of his labor force, the least mobile, least market-oriented production factor.

From reading memoirs of players, I get the feeling that some leading coaches would not be adverse to the revival of either indentured labor or temporary slavery. I am sure that whipping players would be a less time-consuming punishment than having them run up and down the steps of the Texas stadium. It would be equally effective. Coaches need total control over performers. Hence they are not interested in democracy.

The preceding statement was not made to shock, but to draw the reader's attention to the consequences of such a policy. Economies based upon cheap, docile labor prosper only for short periods of time.

The economic history of our South is witness to that. Eventually, better technology reduces their comparative advantage.

It is not at all certain that a better technology of sport is not being developed. The large sports-oriented schools are not the only ones producing successful football players. Ivy leagues, smaller and less competitive, have contributed their share of players to the professional clubs. The more relaxed style of spectator sports played there not only gives the participants a chance to participate in the academic experience, it produces a better-thinking, faster player. Perhaps the time-bomb which will undermine the authority of large spectator-school coaches is already ticking.

Equalizing performance between the sports-successful and other schools could have any number of advantages: Humanization of sport, reduction of commercialism, better opportunities for education of athletes, etc., etc. Unfortunately, setting these targets is easier than achieving them. The financial risks which are likely to be taken by successful schools, with big stadiums, big staffs, and vociferous alumni are too large. Perhaps as much as 10 per cent of the total instructional budget is spent on sports at Texas and Colorado. Perhaps 8 per cent is recaptured back at the gate and from television. Are state systems likely to absorb a reduction in these receipts in the course of the next few years?

To a large extent, both football and basketball, the two major college spectator sports, have been largely self-supporting in schools which consider them important. A combination of gate and television receipts, special funds from state legislatures (in the case of public schools), and earmarked alumni gifts (in the case of a few private ones), have contributed to break-even budgets among the major practitioners of spectator sports. Some may even have turned small profits which were ploughed back to subsidize other athletic endeavours. Recently, however, rising costs have not been offset by rising gate or television revenues. Hence, spectator-oriented sports departments have become increasingly worried about their ability to maintain the scale of their activity. It would also appear that they would be more eager to recoup the expenses they incur from non-spectator sports through other contests, such as track and field or swim meets.

Thus the limited overlap between the post-collegiate spectator sports and those which are staged in international arenas is becoming more important. Football, the number one collegiate sport, is not played internationally. The only major spectator sport played in colleges and internationally is basketball. Other sports which can produce a sizeable, if infrequent, gate are track, and to a lesser extent, swimming. In all of the last three cases, the receipts are enhanced if the competition is international, like the Olympics, or has a faint ideological flavor, e.g., contests with Russians or Mainland Chinese.

The protection of athletes (both from possible injury and from extra-curricular activities which may make them unavailable to the team during the playing season) by the coaches in order to have some control over the gate, and hence their future solvency, is likely to escalate, causing considerable acrimony between colleges and organizations sponsoring international events in proportion to the financial crisis. The controversy now is limited to permitting competition (sanctioning) different events, but the root cause is, undoubtably, autonomy over productive assets.

In a way, money is also at the root of all the other evils cited in connection with the organization of sports. As available budgets shrink, the money for training track and field athletes dries up. Since there is little to be gained from the gate or television rights of sports in which women participate or excel, there are few facilities for women, and even less coaching. What is true for women is also true for occasional sports participants. They are a drain on the budget; furthermore, those who could benefit most from sports are least likely to participate in them without considerable coaxing, or, even more shocking, the development of special programs from which they can benefit!

The syphoning off of talent from the post-secondary sector into international competition is a direct threat to the solvency of sports in the college sector. Yet, bi-national competitions and international

Olympic Games are considered desirable from the point of view of national prestige. Both houses of Congress are increasingly concerned that athletes in college not be penalized for participating in such competitions or selection trials. None of the legislation to date has addressed the impact of drafting players for international competitions or the autonomy of college sports scheduling. They have concentrated instead upon the improvement of arrangements for international participation.

## International Competition

A different matter entirely is the fielding of winning teams in international competitions. Is the United States tapping and developing all the talent which is available? Is it selecting the best athletes to represent it? Congress has been concerned with both issues, but has concentrated its attention on the second one because the interminable squabbling between sports associations has hampered the assembly of the best teams for international competitions.

Federal authorities have intervened twice during the 1960's to settle feuds betwen the NCAA and the AAU. The first time, General Douglas MacArthur was the mediator. The second time, a panel headed by one of the most skilled arbitrators in the United States, Theodore Kheel, and backed by such luminaries as Archibald Cox of Watergate fame, spent over a year hammering out a compromise between competing athletic associations.

Neither compromise appears to have prevented petty feuding between the college coaches association and the committees charged with administering international competitions. As a result, there are still considerable difficulties about ensuring that the best athletes are available to represent the United States in international meets.

To complicate matters further, considerable dissatisfaction of star athletes has filtered up, and has caused deep concern on the Hill about the management of pre-Olympic trials as well as the management of the United States team at the Munich Olympics. There is a growing concensus among a handful of Senators interested in sports that a major reform of the inter-face between U.S. athletes and Olympic and other international competition is well overdue.

A number of bills have been initiated on the Hill, most notably by Congressman O'Hara in the House and by Senator Tunney on the Senate side, which would affect the conduct of international sports contests. Pressure to continue the present status quo by studying the issues to death has been applied by present representatives of international franchises and the Olympic Committee. College coaches represented by the NCAA have also introduced, through the good offices of friendly congressmen, legislation which would (1) reopen the certification of organizations for franchises to sponsor international competitions, and (2) conduct a study of the Olympic Committee.

In order to explain the origins of the activity of the Hill, it is, unfortunately, necessary to start fairly high up-stream. At the cornerstone of the controversy is the definition of an amateur athlete, since only amateurs are allowed to participate in both college and international meets, and only amateurs, not tainted by income from managing sports, can represent the United States on either Olympic committees or on boards of individual sports associations which can arrange international events.

The requirement that athletes not profit from participation in a sport has been the root trouble of much of the collegiate and international competition. No speaking fees, remuneration in excess of expenses for participating in a given meet, or any other form of remuneration tied to the exercise of the sport can be received by a participating athlete, if he is to keep his amateur status. An amateur athlete is forbidden to participate in meets which are run for profit, or where professional athletes participate.

In order to enforce these rules, amateur athletes are allowed to participate only in meets sanctioned by a recognized association in their sport. Because of a series of historical accidents, in a number of sports, notably basketball and track and field (where the disputes center these days), meets in which amateur college athletes can be expected to participate can be sponsored either by associations dominated by college coaches or by holders of national or international franchises. The position taken by associations of college coaches is that an athlete which takes part in a meet not sanctioned (approved) by that organization becomes ineligible to compete in meets which are sponsored by that organization. Thus, an athlete taking part in a meet sponsored by the AAU, which has not been sanctioned by the NCAA, becomes ineligible for most inter-collegiate sports competition. Closed meets, open only to college athletes are outside of the jurisdiction of the AAU. For instance, sometimes the AAU will bar an athlete for participating in a meet it considers open, thus requiring its sanction, which is considered closed by the sponsoring organization. A number of meets, especially in track and field could be open to non-college athletes belonging to clubs, which are members of college-dominated track associations. Because of these and similar jurisdictional squabbles, athletes risk losing eligibility in one or the other sports association competitions.

The reasoning which makes this squabbling possible is ostensibly the need to protect the idea of amateurism -- mostly championed by non-college-based organizations -- and to protect the athlete -- a reason adduced most often by college-based associations. Both sides believe that relaxing their grip on athletes will be fatal to their future bargaining position.

The bargaining is about different matters entirely. It is centered on the rights to hold international franchises, i.e., the arrangements for international and Olympic events. An umbrella organization, the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU), holds these franchises for twenty-three sports. It was established before the turn of the century as a loose confederation of sports clubs. Since that time the locus for training, and most of the talent, in, at least, basketball and track, have moved away from clubs to colleges. College-based associations of these sports would like to be certified as international franchise-holders. The AAU has lamely claimed that it is representative of the sport, since anybody with any ambition to compete internally, whether in college or not, must belong to the AAU. Furthermore, each sport has a number of votes in the election of the United States Olympic Committee. Currently, the AAU can dominate this balloting, and I get the impression that its interests are confounded with the present membership of the U.S. Olympic Committee.

The participants in this squabble between town and gown do not conform to the usual sterotypes in these battles. The town, or AAU, represents the gentlemen interested or dabbling in sports, and the gown, mostly persons who make a living from coaching sports. It is unfortunate that the gentleman-sportsman is not also a man of limitless means and leisure. Hence, in many instances, the Boards of AAU have to rely on gate receipts collected through meets, voluntary donations from the public, as well as membership fees to finance international participation of U.S. teams in international events.

It is paradoxical that college-based organizations, which make it a matter of pride to represent the interests of athletes, are (1) jealous of gate receipts and (2) critical of the penury which surrounds the Olympic trials and the low level of living of athletes at Olympic Games. From reading the testimony at Congressional hearings in both Houses, one gets the impression college-dominated associations could do it better. But could they do it for less? Or for as much? And where is the money going to come from?

Husbanding sufficient resources to reimburse athletes to compete in Olympic trials, to cover the training costs at a reasonable level for those who have been selected, and to provide a number of specialized coaches and officials to defend their interests at Olympic Games were mentioned sufficiently often by athletes and their partisans to make this another burning concern on the Hill. The experience of the Munich Games where the basketball gold medal was denied to the United States (and the action of the Olympic Committee not protested vigorously enough), where two starters were not informed of the schedule for their event, and where an insufficient number of coaches was available (a star discus thrower related that his coach at the Olympics was a walking coach), raised the question about the effectiveness of the U.S. Olympic Committee. The attempts of that committee to rejuvenate itself by selecting former athletes do not seem to have convinced all parties involved that it has turned a new leaf.

The perception that something ought to be done has permeated both sides of the Capitol. Bills have been introduced, and hearings held in the House and in the Senate. Below is a short, and probably idiosyncratic rundown of the action on the Hill.

The House. The action in the House is in the Sub-Committee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor. Congressman O'Hara, Chairman of the sub-committee, introduced a bill (HR 7918) co-sponsored by twenty-three other congressmen to (1) prohibit penalties to athletes and coaches for participating in any meet where they represent the United States, (2) prohibit the exclusion from such meets of athletes banned solely on the basis of previous participation in a non-sanctioned meet of the federation sponsoring the international encounter, (3) require that sponsors of international meets inform the athlete and the institution which he attends about certain facts about the facility, amenities and finances of the meet. A fine of $10,000 is provided for violations of the above.

Clearly, here, the intention is to defuse the jockeying of rival associations, to ensure the availability of the best athletes for international competition. The ambitions of this bill are de minimus. It has been reported out by the sub-committee, but not submitted to the full committee. Additional hearings on this and other bills are scheduled for the end of March, 1974.

One of the co-sponsors of the O'Hara bill, Mr. Badillo, has also introduced the latest version of the Senate bill to regulate sports.

The bill, discussed below, is much broader than the O'Hara bill.

Currently, the Sub-Committee on Education is quite willing to include in its scheduled hearing a discussion of financing of athletes at colleges, sports medecine, etc. While Congressman O'Hara and his colleagues started out with modest goals for their legislation, their inability to push the legislation through in the face of an absence of consensus, has given them the incentive to push their investigation further afield, and it is quite likely that they may report a bill not unlike the one prepared on the Senate side.

The atmosphere on the Hill is certainly not conducive to the peace of mind at the NCAA, the major college-based sports organization. Three identical bills reflecting its position have been introduced in the House (H.R. 9150, H.R. 9171 and H.R. 977). These bills provide for (1) the establishment of the United States Amateur Sports Association Board consisting of five members, which would issue charters for international competition. In other words, the NCAA would like to see international franchises reassigned, and is pushing for a body not dominated by the AAU or the U.S. Olympic Committee to perform this task, (2) a rather weak provision to protect athletes against competing in non-sanctioned events, and (3) the establishment of a temporary nine-member National Commission on Olympic Games, which would be charged to report in six months on the role of the U.S. Olympic Committee in discharging its obligations, selection policies of athletes, and optimum arrangements for their training, and conditions for participation in Olympic Games.

The Action in the Senate. While the interest of the House in sports is rather recent, the Senate Committee on Commerce has had a long-standing interest in the conditions surrounding international athletic competitions. I went back to 1965, and perused the hearings held then, the hearings in 1967, those held in May and November 1973. In addition, the staff of the Commerce Committee graciously provided me with the Kheel, *et al.*, arbitration decision on the dispute between the AAU and the NCAA.

The hearings about the dispute between the AAU and the NCAA cover hundreds of pages of testimony. Essentially, the testimony is repetitive. The AAU defends its right to organize international contests, affirms that all leading athletes are members of AAU, and that AAU is concerned about the athletes' well being. The NCAA claims that the AAU, in order to finance U.S. international participation in the Pan-American and Olympic Games, sponsors interim international contests with badly prepared and poorly coached athletes, under sub-optimal circumstances. It also claims that in basketball and track, the lion's share of amateur activity is now college-based, and is no longer a club-oriented, AAU-based activity.

Both organizations have been behaving outrageously about cross-sanctioning of contests, refusing to ask for the others' sanctions, losing applications, not clearing them until a few days before the meet, or sometimes even ex post facto, when sufficient political pressure was placed upon them not to ruin athletic careers. The intervention of MacArthur and Kheel did not eliminate this squabbling, since the success of any arbitration agreement depends on the good faith of the parties concerned, and there is certainly more bad blood than good faith between the warring organizations.

The U.S. Olympic Committee, which is dominated by the AAU and which suffered considerable loss in prestige as a result of the events surrounding the Munich Games, is attempting to champion the status-quo. It has appointed some prominent athletes to the Board, but to my mind, it is still a collection of gentlemen/women sportsmen on an ego trip.

The record of the November 5, 1973 hearings contains an amazing letter from the International Olympic Committee in London. It makes the relevant point that no international franchise can be held by organizations dominated by professionals -- and college coaches fall under that definition according to the International Committee. It closes with a critique of Senate initiatives to support international contests by calling such initiatives totalitarian. My guess would be that this letter was written as a result of the concern of the U.S. Olympic Committee. If my surmise is correct, it demonstrates the lack of feeling and realism of that Committee: the august Senate body of the United States does not like to be told what it can and cannot do.

The concerns of athletes who testified at Senate hearings polarized along the following lines: (1) Star athletes bemoaned the lack of accomodations, the lack of reimbursement of expenses for participants in Olympic trials, the absence of sufficient coaches at the Olympics, and the ineptness of the U.S. Olympic Committee in defending the interests of athletes; (2) Other stars complained about the war of nerves which discouraged athletes from participating in international meets because meets were not sanctioned at the time athletes were recruited, and (3) Non-college-based athletes complained about the absence of training facilities and funds to sponsor talent searches and training programs.

Senate action spearheaded by Senator Tunney resulted in an original version of S.2365, which established an activist United States Amateur Sports Board. This was authorized, *inter alia*, to meet 48 hours after an association asked for a decision to sanction a meet, and sanction it. In the event the meet was sanctioned by the Board, no penalties could be assessed against the participants.

The version of the bill which was finally reported out of committee is much tamer. It still provides for an Amateur Sports Board, consisting of five members appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate, which does have rights to "secure data and express opinion with respect to any matter pertinent to amateur athletic activity and physical fitness," require reports from chartered sports associations, which it will designate as holders of international franchises (usually not more than one per association), mediate disputes, and most importantly, oversee the sanctioning of contests.

The new version of S.2365 also calls for the appointment of a nine-member U.S. Olympic Study Commission which will report on reforms to improve the U.S. competition in Olympic Games.

Finally, it provides the establishment of the National Sports Foundation, with a board of trustees appointed by the Amateur Sports Board. The Foundation is to be financed equally by the Federal Government and private contributions, and be allowed to have an endowment of $100 million. The primary role of the Foundation is to encourage grass root athletic programs, usually not sponsored by either a college or a club.

The very last version of the bill is still in the works. I have been told by the Senate Commerce Committee counsel that it will

(1) put a six-year term limitation on the life of the Sports Advisory Board, thus defusing NCAA criticism about the Senate promoting a new layer of federal bureaucrats,

(2) the Foundation's scope, by contrast, will be strengthened. It will have a broader mandate, and will concern itself with sponsoring (a) a network of athletic facilities, and (b) have advisory authority on athletic medecine and health.

The implications of this last change are far-reaching. It will satisfy some House critics and facilitate the important passage of the bill in the lower chamber. In my opinion, these provisions are important and will protect, in the long run, amateur athletes from rule changes which could endanger their health, especially those changes which may be introduced in college sports to make them more exciting on television.

Strangely enough, the new version of the bill is likely to have NCAA support. Once again, President Nixon's actions are likely to produce a coalition of unlikely parties. Recently, the Executive, as part of the appropriations bill for the Department of State, asked for $500,000 to finance an Olympic Study Commission. The membership of the Commission, according to sources on the Hill, was stacked to whitewash the present Olympic Committee. A Senate staffer referred to its composition as squash players and yachtsmen (neither of these being Olympic Sports).

The fear that the commission would recommend the continuation of the status-quo is rumoured to have moved the NCAA leadership to back the more comprehensive Senate action. Momentarily, a call is expected from the NCAA endorsing the latest version of the Tunney bill. As soon as the phone rings, the bill will be brought to the floor!

The functions of the Foundation in financing pre-Olympic athletic trials is not set. Its relationship to the Olympic Committee is unclear. The big fight for resources of the Foundation is still in the future. The federal role in collegiate sports is still to be clarified.

## Conclusions

Current congressional action does not begin to address the key problems in post-secondary sports. There is general agreement that pressures to escalate performance in spectator sports are mounting. It is also a consensus that these pressures may accentuate abuses in recruitment, training, etc. Financing of other sports are threatened, as revenues of spectator sports fail to grow sufficiently quickly to keep up with expenses. Under these circumstances, a study of the whole spectrum of college sports is extremely timely. Questions like the following need to be asked:

### Spectator Sports

1. What are the most effective ways of policing spectator sports?

2. What type of organization would be most effective in policing them? How should it be financed, and how much money would it need? Who should sponsor it?

3. If it is impossible to regulate spectator sports effectively, should some thought be given to ways of equalizing the strength of teams within each league? Would it be conceivable to vary the size of permitted rosters in some proportion to the win/loss record?

4. Is it possible to reduce the expenses associated with

major spectator sports by pooling facilities between post-secondary institutions, secondary institutions and amateur athletic clubs? Or perhaps it may be possible to vest the ownership of those institutions into the hands of third parties who could make greater use of them?

5. Can reasonable standards be developed for permissable expenditures on spectator sports, and could they be enforced?

## Other College and International Competitions

1. Can facilities be shared by athletes in non-spectator sports?

2. How can adequate coaching in track and field, etc., be made available on a national basis?

3. What is the responsibility of post-secondary institutions in facilitating the participation of star athletes in international competitions?

4. How can the feuds between different associations be reduced?

## Sports for Everybody

1. Should standards be established in the college sector to make it possible for the physically fat to become physically fit by encouraging sports participation in activities of differing difficulty?

2. Is it possible to develop standards and estimate costs of desirable levels of intra-mural sports activity?

3. What are the responsibilities of the post-secondary sector in educating its constituency as potential occasional participants or viewers of sports events?

## Federal Involvement

1. What should the thrusts be, and what are the possible dimensions of realistic federal involvement in amateur sports?

APPENDIX F

# NEW AND CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES
# WHICH HAVE INFLUENCED THE CONDUCT OF
# INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PROGRAMS
# IN THE UNITED STATES SINCE 1930

by

Bernard P. Ireland

March 1, 1974

# FOREWORD

When George H. Hanford, Executive Vice President of the College Entrance Examination Board, responded favorably to the request of the American Council on Education that he direct a feasibility study to assist the Council in deciding whether there is need for a searching study of the present state of American intercollegiate athletics, he asked me to assist him by preparing a statement about the pertinent forces and influences which have developed since the 1929 publication of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching Bulletin No.23, American College Athletics. This paper is an attempt to respond to Mr. Hanford's charge.

It should be made clear at the outset that the author has resisted the seductive allure of attempting to respond to the implications of Mr. Hanford's loose use of the phrase "historical statement" as a part of his description of my assignment. Neither the competence of the writer nor the time available makes such an attempt practicable. The statement makes no pretense, therefore, of being based on scholarly research. It reflects, rather, observations gleaned from twenty-five years of admissions and financial-aid-committee work at Columbia University and from thirteen years of cooperative activity with colleges and secondary schools as a member of the staff of the College Entrance Examination Board; a lifetime of playing games with an enthusiasm which far surpassed competence; a casual and sporadic addiction to the joys of the spectator; long and regular exposure to the sports pages of The New York Times; reading like that represented by the appended Bibliography; and, in particular, the perspective gained from conversations with many experienced observers of athletic competition as it is related to education.

Whatever helpful support this paper may provide for the feasibility study stems chiefly from the testimony of these observers. For time freely given to extended conversations and for insights provided I am particularly grateful to: Walter Byers, Executive Director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association; Henry Chauncey, Jr., Secretary of Yale University; Christopher Corkery, Headmaster of Cranbrook School, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan; H. O. Crisler, former head football coach and Director of Athletics at the University of Michigan; the late Arthur Daley, sports writer of The New York Times; John T. Daly, Executive Secretary of the Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference Board of Control; Lester H. Dye, Director of Athletics of Syracuse University; A. O. Duer, Executive Secretary of the National Association of Intercollegiate Athletics; Jeremiah Ford II, former Director of Athletics at the University of Pennsylvania; Paul Governali, Professor of Physical Education at San Diego State College; George E. Killian, Executive Director of the National Junior College Athletic Association; DeLaney Kiphuth, Director of Athletics at Yale University; Leonard Koppett, sports writer of The New York Times; Nicholas McD. McKnight, former Associate and Acting Dean of Columbia College of Columbia University; Donald McMillen, Principal of Central High

School, Pontiac, Michigan; John Piurek, Director of Athletics at West Haven (Connecticut) High School; Eugene T. Rossides, senior partner of the New York-Washington law firm of Rogers and Wells; Adolph Samborski, Commissioner of the Yankee Conference; and John Toner, Director of Athletics of the University of Connecticut.

Fair warning is served on the reader that what follows is highly generalized, sparsely documented, liberally salted with passages which reveal the author's bias, and contains little, if anything, which will not be obvious to those who are familiar with what has been taking place in intercollegiate athletics. The chief justification for presenting it, therefore, is the hope that it may serve as a useful summary and reminder of some of the forces which must be reckoned with in any serious attempt to make intercollegiate athletics play their proper role in the education of the young.

B.P.I.

Since the publication of American College Athletics[1], changes in the forces affecting the conduct of intercollegiate athletics programs have been so numerous and powerful as to boggle the minds of any of the authors of Bulletin 23 who might be comparing the 1929 circumstances with those of 1974. In the light of commonly accepted current coaching practices and the pervasive influence of television, for example, the comments of Savage and his colleagues about the evils of coaching from the sidelines and about the insidious influences of radio broadcasting in the 1920's seem quaint. And Savage et al would undoubtedly be perplexed and baffled to observe that many of the abuses in the recruiting and subsidizing of athletes which were viewed with distaste and alarm in 1929 are, in 1974, alive and thriving with the sanction of NCAA rules and regulations.

Providing more detailed comment about the past, as described in Bulletin 23, versus more recent years would be appropriate. Any suitably brief comparison, however, would be a time-wasting attempt to gild the lily; for Mr. Hanford prepared, in July 1973, a working paper entitled "American College Athletics in Retrospect, a Backward 1973 Look at the 1929 Report," which supplies the kind of background needed here and which is appended as an attachment.

First, then, here is a simple listing of some of the forces which—for better or for worse—have emerged or grown since 1930 to influence the conduct of intercollegiate athletic programs:

—television

—improved transportation

—institutionalization of professionalism

—the growth of hockey

—democratization of student bodies

—increased press coverage of professional sports

—the women's liberation movement

---

[1] Savage, Howard J., American College Athletics (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Bulletin 23, 1929). For the sake of brevity this publication will be referred to throughout this paper simply as Bulletin 23.

—the growth of professional sports

—changes of style and emphasis in coaching football

—improved and expanded physical facilities

—multiplication of demands on time of student athletes

—the growth of highly organized athletic competition for children

While several items might be added to the above list, it seems likely that most of the significant related forces which have emerged over the last forty years may be subsumed under one of those mentioned. At the risk of an absurd laboring of the obvious, here are a few comments about the listed phenomena.

Television: In an excellent article on the subject from the December 29, 1969, issue of Sports Illustrated and included in Sports & Society: An Anthology, William Johnson says: "In the past ten years sport in America has come to be the stepchild of television and, in a sense, handmaiden to the vicissitudes of Madison Avenue...: the impact of television in these last ten years has produced more revolutionary—and irrevocable—changes in sport than anything since mankind began to play organized games."[2] In the same article Johnson quotes Bear Bryant as saying what has been said in slightly different words by several other big-time football coaches: "We think TV exposure is so important to our program and so important to this university that we will schedule ourselves to fit the medium. I'll play at midnight if that's what TV wants."[3]

The first telecast of a sports event in the United States, according to Johnson, was of a baseball game between Columbia and Princeton in May of 1939.[4] From that inauspicious beginning, a primitive attempt to convey a pictorial account of the gyrations of two teams fighting "for fourth place in the Ivy League," the genie which was released from the bottle there at Baker Field grew and multiplied. That growth was particularly rapid beginning about 1950 and continued until one of the miracles the full-grown spirit produced was that part of the 1973 NCAA Television Committee Report which pointed out that "participating members received $13,490,000 in television rights in both 1972 and 1973...." and that the 1975-76 Television Plan was sold to ABC-TV for $16,000,000. Moreover, the December 15, 1973, issue of the NCAA News reports, with obvious pride in the role of the

---

[2] Johnson, William, "TV Made It All A New Game," in John T. Talamini & Charles H. Page, editors, Sports & Society: An Anthology (Boston-Toronto: Little Brown and Company, 1973), p. 456.

[3] Ibid., p. 457.

[4] Ibid., p. 458.

Association in the matter, on the growth in "the swag" derived from post-season Bowl competition. The News points out that "the second Rose Bowl game in 1916, the first one with a cash payoff," produced for the two participants, Brown University and Washington State, the paltry sum of $7,631.50 whereas "bowl loot" [sic] from ten bowl games of 1972 totaled a tidy $7,489,271. "All-time Bowl Payoffs," over the fifty-eight years during which the spring of small change discovered at the 1916 Rose Bowl has swelled into a torrent of riches, total $80,604,647.80.

One need not go on piling up figures to emphasize that intercollegiate athletic competition, particularly in football and basketball, has long since become big business. In response to the derogatory connotions which some attach to the use in this context of the phrase "big business," those who see TV income as an unmitigated blessing will point to improvement of physical facilities, expansion of intramural programs, and other praiseworthy achievements which, without that income, would have been impossible. On the other hand, one must observe that the "participating members" are a relatively small number of the nation's colleges; and one must wonder whether the real educational advantages which accrue to the lucky recipients of "the swag" outweigh the educational damage inflicted on the large numbers of non-participating institutions which adopt athletic policies and programs unsuited to their size and educational objectives with the hope that they too may have a day in the TV sun and a share of the "loot."

Johnson is undoubtedly right in saying that the impact of TV on sports is "irrevocable." There can be no doubt, however, that any serious attempt to improve the relationship between intercollegiate athletics and other parts of an educational program must try to find ways to neutralize the excesses and spread the advantages related to televising intercollegiate games.

Improved transportation: At least one highly influential conferee tended to give top billing to the advent of jet travel on the list of forces under discussion. Intercollegiate athletics contests of the 1920's and earlier were, with very few exceptions, restricted to "friendly strife" between neighbors, broadly defined, because there were relatively modest limits to the distance the friendly strivers could be expected to travel on bus or train in the time available. In those days the trip from Princeton, New Jersey, to Hanover, New Hampshire, was more time consuming and much more tiring than is the present-day jet-airline journey from New York to San Francisco. With the availability of quick and comfortable transportation over long distances came a revolution in schedule-making, particularly among the football and basketball powers. In recent years it has become commonplace to find, as we did in 1973 for random example, the Penn State football forces playing those of Stanford and the Air Force Academy; and the men of Syracuse having at those of the University of Washington and of the University of Miami, Florida.

This facilitation of long-range travel was, of course, a potent addition to those forces hospitable to increasing commercialism of intercollegiate contests. One might make a travel-is-broadening case for the educational merits of transcontinental schedules except for the plain fact that the members of the squads involved rarely do or see anything on the trips that they do not do or see at home. Said one intimately well informed witness: "It's ridiculous. We fly the boys to places they may never again be able to visit and all they see is the interior of the plane, their dormitory rooms, the dressing rooms and the inside of the stadium!" Unhappily, it is all too clear that the chief motivation for making such schedules is the attempt to arrange a combination of powerful forces and location designed to provide maximum stimulation of attendance and gate receipts.

Recruiting of "blue chip" athletes has also intensified under the stimulus of jet travel. Institutions with resources to make it possible to take full advantages of the NCAA provision which permits members to finance one round trip to their campuses for a student-athlete* have in recent years exercised that option by shuttling the most outstanding prospects across vast reaches of the continent at a great rate. Rumor hath it that there are reprehensible characters in our midst who find ways to circumvent the "one-visit" restrictions in order to court more vigorously the most vividly blue of the blue chippers. Be that as it may, the phenomenon has almost certainly had a major impact on the trend toward concentrating the supply of superior athletes on a relatively small number of campuses and so moving those institutions one step closer to devoting a disproportionate amount of their resources to providing a farm system for the professional-sports-entertainment industry.

For striking evidence of this trend one need only remind himself of what has happened to U. S. Military Academy football in recent years. In the late 1940's, while playing many of the strongest teams in the nation, Army went undefeated for 32 consecutive games. In 1973, still trying to cope with powerful opposition, Army won not a single game. Indeed, the men from West Point succumbed to almost all of their opponents by lopsided scores. Two of the drubbings, only slightly more shocking than the others, were a 62-3 loss to Notre Dame and another to the University of California, 51-6. The 32-game streak was broken in 1947 by Columbia—of all places—and those who love the Light Blue Lions are painfully aware of how hard put to it they have been to win more than a game or two against Ivy League teams in recent years.

Where were the Blanchards, the Davises, the Rossideses and the Swiackis of 1973? Most of them gone to one of the relatively small number of institutions which play big-time football and where the road to consideration for a lucrative professional contract is more clearly marked—

---

*Like many others, I detest the implications of this term but use it reluctantly for the sake of convenience.

and shorter. The relationship between the fall of mighty Army and the fact that its players who have professional football ambitions must delay them for five years beyond graduation is something more than coincidence.

Institutionalization of professionalism: The final paragraphs of the preceding section provides a fitting transition to this one. It is hardly news that in recent years there has been an acceleration of the tendency for those colleges and universities either committed to, or aspiring to, the maintenance of big-time athletic programs to assume more of trappings of the professional entertainment world: the high-pressure recruiting measures suggested above; the bidding—both legal and under-the table—for the "meat on the hoof"; the building of huge stadiums, gymnasiums, and rinks in order to accommodate larger numbers of cash customers at rates undreamed of by the authors of Bulletin 23; the hiring of coaches devoted to the conviction that "winning is everything," coaches who are often more widely known than, and at least as well paid as, their presidents; the ever-growing array of post-season Bowl football games and basketball tournaments aimed, in greater degree than is commonly recognized, at squeezing more admissions dollars out of the willing spectators; the staging of half-time extravaganza featuring magnificently trained bands and mini-clad girls to the end that no TV watcher shall permit his attention to wander long enough to deprive him of the uplift of the "messages" in the commercials—the familiar list goes on and on.

While all of this has been happening, NCAA has not been an entirely innocent bystander. It has already been noted that many of the abuses of recruiting and subsidization of athletes decried in Carnegie Bulletin 23 now have the blessing of NCAA rules and regulations. NCAA authorities point out that those regulations were designed by, and can be changed by, representatives of member institutions. True enough, but there are those critics who question whether college presidents have been sufficiently vigilant about appointing NCAA delegates who are truly representative of the educational interests of their institutions.

That we may be seeing an aroused concern about this matter is suggested by the following part of a letter to the editor in the January 28, 1974, edition of The Chronicle of Higher Education in which Brother Mel Anderson, F.S.C., President of St. Mary's College, Moraga, California wrote:

> From what I know of the N.C.A.A. charter, it is the presidents of the colleges and universities who have the ultimate power to regulate the N.C.A.A., which, in turn, regulates the conduct of sports. I believe it is time for the presidents to exercise more directly their right to determine policies of the N.C.A.A. The presidents could address themselves to areas

> of primal concern, such as scholarships, recruitment practices, size and qualifications of coaching staffs, length of seasons, etc., and leave to the athletic directors the technical matters in gamesmanship.
>
> It has always seemed ironic to me that taxpayers or donors should be paying for training camps (the college teams) for professional athletics when other students preparing for other professions (e.g., education, law, medicine) have to pay their way unless they can demonstrate financial needs to qualify for limited scholarship assistance....

How the institutions, as represented by NCAA, are allowing themselves, by making one innocuous-appearing concession after another to be gradually sucked into the quicksand of professionalism is exemplified by two recent NCAA actions. (1) A year or so ago NCAA gave its approval to the inclusion of beer commercials among those used at NCAA-sponsored athletic events shown on television. At the 1974 Annual Convention that approval was broadened to include wine commercials. (2) More far-reaching in its implications, however, was the action taken to make it possible for a college athlete to enter into an agreement to compete in professional athletics in a particular sport and still maintain his eligibility to compete in college in any other sport.

The growth of hockey: Most of the questionable practices described in American College Athletics tended to cluster around football and basketball, games which have continued to produce more than their share of offenses against ethical behavior and NCAA regulations. Since 1930, however, hockey, a new contender for honors—or dishonors—has emerged on the intercollegiate athletic scene. To be sure, hockey had been played at a relatively small number of colleges and independent schools, particularly in New England and Big Ten territory, prior to 1930. Its major intercollegiate development, however, has been during the last thirty years.

The "hockey explosion," beginning with the rapid growth of professional hockey about 1920, made its repercussions felt in the secondary schools and colleges of the United States shortly thereafter. Since 1930, the rapid construction of rinks has been accompanied by formulation of ambitious intercollegiate and interscholastic schedules of games. For example, one well informed witness estimates that, whereas twenty years ago there were no more than three or four Connecticut high schools which supported hockey teams, there are now about forty such schools in the state.

Hockey's growth in popularity appears to have brought with it not only the addition of a sport to many school and college schedules but also some extraordinary pressures which reflect special influences of professionalism. For example, it appears to be traditional for hockey players to practice at all hours of the day and night, to play stoically with serious injuries, and to revel in violence. Another of these special influences stems from the fact that large numbers of the better players come out of the New Hampshire-based Junior A Hockey League. This League, a pressure-packed training ground for those who aspire to become professionals, is organized so that the high-school-age participants play approximately 80 games in a season. Obviously, little if any time remains for them to compete for the high schools they attend—in hockey or anything else.

This arrangement undoubtedly has much to do with the observations of a knowledgeable official at an Ivy League university. He emphasizes that promising hockey players, particularly those reared in the Canadian tradition, are encouraged to think of themselves as hockey players who go to school "on the side." This tradition, their special training and conditioning, and the fact that they are often admitted on dubious academic credentials is a combination which accentuates the tendency for hockey players to become isolated cliques within student bodies.

Still another hockey phenomenon, the insistence from spectators that games feature organized mayhem appears to reflect the professional influence. In a well known independent school made up predominantly of boys from upper middle class homes, the kind of place which tries to teach the finest traditions of gentility and amateurism, an administrator reported that the school had been forced to threaten to ban spectators from hockey games. The threatened ban followed assaults on referees and repeated incidents in which the fans had incited the players to extremes of violence. "TV's airing of professional games is a part of what is behind all this," surmised the witness. "Seeing the fisticuffs, use of sticks as lethal weapons, and assorted bloodletting so often featured in these games, a lunatic fringe of fans assume that the way the pros do it is the way our boys ought to do it."

This testimony is supported by Gerald Eskanazi's February 18, 1974, report in The New York Times of what happened on February 17 in "a three-hour trench-warfare game between two of the National [Hockey] League's best clubs...." Mr. Eskanazi's story is entitled "Now, Kids, This is Real Hockey" and began by suggesting that it "might have been the bloodiest Sunday on television since peace with honor in Vietnam...." He then went on to explain how, as extra enticement to youthful watchers, the National Broadcasting Company "...has come up with an attractive gimmick for youngsters known as Peter Puck,... a cartoon character who painlessly explains rules to children.... When the second period drew to a close, the boys and girls got a more vivid explanation. A fight broke out involving the Flyers' Bobby Clarke, and both benches emptied....Ted

Lindsay, the commentary man on the telecast, backed Clarke.... He said that Clarke wasn't dirty, that he simply was showing 'guts'. Then Lindsay added, 'If you don't have guts and you can't take it, you don't belong in hockey.' This inspiring bit of advise to youngsters soon was followed by the sight of 38 players pawing one another, some punching.... Presumably, those who remain in kids' leagues across North America will be those with guts."

Democratization of college student bodies: When Bulletin 23 was published, the nation's colleges and universities were not far removed from the age in which they were commonly regarded as all but exclusively the domain of the socially and economically privileged. To be sure, some of the poor-but-proud had earlier aspired to and attended institutions of higher education. In 1862 the passage of the Morrill Act cleared the way for the establishment of the land-grant colleges and the broadening of the base. It was not until military men and women began to return from World War II in 1946, however, and to take advantage of the educational provisions of the G.I. Bill of Rights that colleges and universities of all kinds and in all parts of the nation began to enroll student bodies which contained significant proportions of students from the ranks of "the common people." Then the Civil Rights Act of 1957 with its creation of the Commission on Civil Rights, and the Supreme Court decisions of 1954 and 1955 declaring racial segregation in the public schools unconstitutional combined, at long last, to arouse the public conscience sufficiently to encourage the college enrollment of increased numbers of young people from minority/poverty backgrounds, preponderantly blacks and Puerto Ricans.

The story of the minority-population student-athlete, particularly the black athlete—how he is being both used and helped because of his athletic prowess, and how his presence on athletic squads in ever increasing numbers has resulted in racial stresses and strains—is a much-too-complex sociological study to be treated here. In any event, another member of the panel of consultants on this feasibility study is giving the topic his special attention. It is clear, however, that the increasingly large representation in our colleges from this stratum of our society is a factor which must have a prominent place in the thinking of those who would improve the educational effectiveness of intercollegiate athletics.

Increased press coverage of professional sports: Many critics of the growing commercialism of both professional and intercollegiate sports have made persuasive cases for the existence of an incestuous triangle: television, the press and big business, they say, are busy scratching each other's backs in ways designed to stimulate larger profits for all. The familiar cycle goes: business wants to sell products; the sale of products is stimulated by advertising in the press and on television; studies have demonstrated that the most effective advertising in newspapers is in those papers featuring wide sports coverage; contests to be televised must be carefully chosen so that those paying the bill will be assured of a large audience to see the commercials; to merit any significant attention on sports pages, and so to have a reputation which will give an institution a chance at a share of the TV money, the college must get into the frenetic business of trying to win at any cost; etc. ad infinitum.

The press, with some justification, points out that they, like other business enterprises, are in business to make a profit and that it must, therefore, print the sporting news which will be most attractive to advertisers. Hence, the apparent trend is toward printing an ever-larger proportion of news and comment about professional sports; and any college which is beguiled by the publicity value of prominent headlines must get into the big-time scramble.

According to Savage,[5] the trend was in the other direction in 1929. He pointed out that "...amateur sports, especially college and school athletics, have been increasingly emphasized over the past fourteen years." The reversal of that trend is suggested by some comparative figures. In the issues of The New York Times published during six weekdays of the week of November 14, 1927 (according to Savage) the average daily distribution of space devoted to sports news was as follows: professional - 128 inches; school, college and other amateur sports - 223 inches. The...Times of Thursday, December 20, 1973, carried approximately 353 inches of professional sports news and only 113 inches of news about school, college and other amateur sports. On Sunday, December 23, 1973, The...Times ran (exclusive of two full pages listing the "Roster of Winners of Individual and Team Championships in Sports During 1973") 805 inches of professional sports coverage and 315 inches about school, college and other amateur sports. It is interesting to note also that the front page of the sports section of that issue was devoted entirely to professional sports.

Obviously, the samples cited above are too small to have statistical validity; but it seems likely that they tell an accurate story. The message seems clear: "If you want significant recognition in the press for your athletic teams, run either a professional or professionalized program."

The women's liberation movement: As another member of the feasibility-study panel is dealing with this topic in some detail, it is mentioned here only to assure a reasonably complete listing of the forces of change under discussion. It may be noted in passing, however, that several bits of evidence that the movement is not just a passing fad have come to the author's attention.

It is now the established policy of the Connecticut Interscholastic Athletic Conference Board of Control that girls shall be eligible to participate with boys on such teams as swimming, tennis, track, and gymnastics when they are able to equal or surpass the performance of their male peers. (Unfortunately, the existence of this policy tends to inhibit the development of women's interscholastic team competition.) Yale's swimming team boasts a point-winning woman as one of its divers. Another of its coeds won the number six position on the men's tennis team but elected to play number one on the women's team. And, most persuasive of all, was the testimony of an Indiana University representative at the 1974 NCAA Convention that his institution has made what sounded like fully equal provisions for men and women in all aspects of its athletic program.

---

[5] Op.cit., p. 272.

The growth of professional sports: While only the sparsest of documentation has been gathered about this point for this paper, none should be needed to persuade even the most casual observer that there has been a spectacular growth in professional sports since 1930. That growth has included the birth of new competing leagues: the World Hockey Association in 1971 to challenge the old National Hockey League; the American Basketball Association a few years earlier to give the National Basketball Association a run for its money; the American Football League, also in recent years, to seize Super Bowl supremacy from the more venerable National Football League—and both being threatened in 1974 by the newest newcomer, the World Football League. In the single year of 1967 the National Hockey League doubled in size.[6] Professional baseball, the pioneer of professional sports in the United States, expanded its ranks from eight teams to ten in the American League in 1961 and the National League followed suit in 1962. The net to capture more baseball fans was cast more widely with the advent of night baseball when they turned on the lights in Crosley Field in 1935. Moreover, a number of sports which had made little or no impact on the professional sporting world when Bulletin 23 was published, have emerged to make strong bids for their share of the entertainment dollar. The most obvious of these are tennis, track and soccer.

All this expansion has inevitably multiplied the demand and the competition for the services of professional athletes. Little wonder that colleges are being subjected to increasing pressures to turn their teams into farm clubs for the pros.

Changes in style and emphasis in coaching college football: There are numerous pertinent aspects of this topic which might be discussed by one properly qualified. The two most obvious changes which have been instituted somewhere along the way within the last forty years, however, are prolonged organized spring practice sessions and the platooning system.

---

[6] Gutman, Bill, The Hockey Explosion (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1973). p.75.

When a director of athletics at an institution which plays big-time football bemoaned the overemphasis implicit in both spring practice and platooning was asked why he hadn't given them up, he replied, "Because that's the way the pros operate and many of us feel that we are obliged to ape the pros if we're going to keep up with our competition."

Platooning, of course, has the obvious virtues of providing for a larger number of players opportunities to compete and acting as at least partial insurance against dangerous extremes of exhaustion of those attempting to be Iron Men. Nevertheless, the critics of platooning see it as encouraging a robot-like specialization which threatens the joy and educational value players might receive from performing on both offense and defense.

Improved and expanded physical facilities: This is another item included in the listing of changes chiefly in the interest of attempted completeness. While no supporting statistical evidence is here presented, it seems obvious that equipment, playing fields and buildings used in intercollegiate athletic programs have, generally speaking, been vastly improved and that the number and size of gymnasiums, stadiums, rinks, playing fields and field houses have more than kept pace with the growth of the total educational plant. It seems unlikely that the reference in Bulletin 23 to "...clothing worn without washing for four years...."[7] alluded to the typical state of the attire of the pre-1929 athlete. It does suggest, however, that current hygienic standards can hardly fail to have improved.

The intended reminder here is, of course, that institutions are prone to become the slaves rather than the masters of the more elaborate buildings erected to support programs of intercollegiate athletics. Huge stadiums must be filled with reasonable regularity if their maintenance is not to become an intolerable drag on a university's total financing. When they are erected, therefore, the institution is likely to be trapped beyond recall in the cycle of conducting high-pressured recruiting, hiring coaches who are more managers of big business than teachers, and espousing the win-at-all-costs madness—all aimed disproportionately at keeping that stadium filled with buyers of high-priced tickets.

Multiplication of demands on time of student-athletes: Mens sana in corpore sano, the ancient ideal, continues to express a widely accepted principle; but what constitutes a sensible balance between cultivation of the mind and athletic stimulation of the body is a subject which calls for renewed study. One witness expressed a deep concern, which was echoed by many others, about "excessive expectations" of student-athletes. While it seems clear that the college athlete has for a long time been expected to make a total effort beyond that expected of lesser mortals, there can be little doubt that those athletes who wish to excel are spending much more time in training than was expected of them forty years ago. Indeed, there has been a sharp increase in time so spent within the last ten years. A Yale observer reports that Chuck Holum, the captain of the 1974 Yale swimming team, "spends three times as much time in practice as did Don Schollander," the world's fastest swimmer until Mark Spitz came along. "Schollander and his teammates...swam a mere 3,500 yards a day in training" in the late 1960's, whereas Holum ordinarily doesn't regard his training day complete until he has swum "7000-10,000 yards—or somewhere between four and six miles."[8]

---

[7] Savage, op.cit., p. 158.

While this may be an extreme example, it appears to be not too different from what has been happening in other sports. Football, basketball and hockey, as played in institutions which maintain big-time athletic policies, make the most extreme demands on the day-to-day, almost-year-round time of the players. These demands, and their recent multiplication, are also apparent, however, in other sports, perhaps most notably in track, cross-country, tennis and swimming.

This trend calls for leadership in attempting to restore some kind of sensible balance to what is expected or permitted within the framework of a truly educational institution. Some of the most loyal and constructive supporters of the educational values of intercollegiate athletics are deeply concerned about the probability that institutional and community pressures which impel large numbers of student-athletes to spend a disproportionate part of their time in athletic training are depriving them of the balanced educational experience they have a right to expect.

The growth of highly organized athletic competition for children: Little League Baseball was officially founded as a going organization in 1939. When, in 1947, the first Little League World Series was staged, the machinery was in full gear for the development of a phenomenon which has been widely praised and blamed. In hundreds of communities all over the country, children from seven to twelve years of age are playing the game in a way which resembles only vaguely the casual pick-up-sides encounters which the young of that age used to organize for themselves. The dusty vacant lots, the beat-up ancient object which served as a ball, the all-purpose bat, the gloves with no padding or padding in the wrong places, the casual passer-by pressed into service as an umpire, the bases improvised from any suitably-shaped board or rock which might be at hand—all these are relics of the past in Little League towns. They have yielded to miniature reproductions of professional baseball replete with expensive equipment tailored to individuals, well manicured diamonds of precise dimensions, coaches to teach not only the basic skills of the game but also to emphasize the importance of winning, uniformed umpires, formal schedules of games and impressive trophies for members of teams which win often enough. For a small number, of course, there is the World Series at the end of the rainbow.

---

[8] Mark Singer, "Swim! Run! Increase that Cardio-Vascular Potential," Yale Alumni Magazine, December 1973 (New Haven, Yale Alumni Publications, Inc.) p. 23.

Admirers of Little League point to the merits of organized versus casual competition, the benefits of close supervision and coaching, the saving of thousands of youngsters from the work which the devil finds for idle hands to do, the discipline which "makes men out of them," and the head start on athletic careers for those who excel. Detractors are concerned about the pressures exerted by parents and coaches hungry for recognition and victory, the psychological strains placed on players expected to perform like professionals while they are still babes in arms, the lasting damage to young arms trying to throw curve balls with muscles and bone structure not yet ready for that kind of exertion, and the probability that many are so "turned off" by regimentation as to deprive them of the satisfactions they might have derived from athletic participation in their high school and college years.

If undue emphasis has been given to these comments about Little League, it is because that organization has apparently set the pattern for similar, though less-publicized, developments in other sports, particularly in hockey and football. No precise statistics have been gathered about the extent of these activities; but comments of knowledgeable observers indicate that they are epidemic, at least in parts of the nation. Pee Wee hockey is growing in popularity throughout New England where seven and eight-year-old tots are routed out of their cribs at five o'clock in the morning to sharpen their skating skills and their slap shots before the ice is commandeered for the use of others. One such group uses the Yale rink where they play "eighteen more games than does the Yale varsity." In the process, says the witness, the players belabor each other with sticks, drop gloves to square off in fisticuffs, and otherwise comport themselves like miniature specimens of the professional paragons they see on the television screen. (Please see also Eskanazi story on p. 7.) In the Midwest, at least, according to another reporter, there are football leagues of eight year olds in which the participants "practice under lights until as late as 9:00 o'clock at night and play interstate schedules."

One may properly question whether these developments are related in any important way to a discussion of changes which are influencing the conduct of intercollegiate athletics. Nevertheless, remote though the connection may be, it seems worth suggesting that any painstaking survey of the topic ought to include at least an exploration of whether there is indeed a significant relationship between the pressures of professionalism brought to bear on children and those experienced by college athletes.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Although the above concluded my attempt to comply with Mr. Hanford's charge, I feel impelled to add a brief summary of the most insistently recurring themes, either implicit or explicit, in the conversations in which I have participated and much of the reading I have done. Those themes are:

1. That the proposed study should be made. Some conferees were skeptical about the possibility of reforming the more obvious evils in the system because of their belief that those evils are a reflection of what the great masses of the people want and that the real problem, therefore, is the formidable one of reforming the mores of our society. On the other hand, most felt that the "saving remnant" has a moral obligation to try to turn back the tide and that, in any event, the study is worth doing even if only to bring the historical record up to date.

2. That one of the primary concerns of the Commission, if formed, ought to be for devising a plan which might make it possible for college presidents to recapture control of the policies governing intercollegiate athletics on their campuses.

3. That the Commission, if formed, should give particular and professional attention to an analysis of the financing of intercollegiate athletic programs. The opinion is widely held that if rigorous cost-accounting procedures were applied to demonstrating the real cost of supporting the programs in institutions which are, or are trying to be, "big-time," the facts might shock administrators into remedial action.

   Many believe that most of the problems clustering around the institutionalization of professionalism could be solved if administrators could be persuaded to insist that intercollegiate athletic programs be financed entirely from general funds and that any income from contests go into general funds. Observing this fundamental principle would pose the issue squarely: intercollegiate athletic programs would be obliged to justify their existence as an important part of the total educational program just as are the departments of English or Chemistry.

4. That the Commission, if formed, should also give special attention to a study of the charge that, even at the level of competition represented by the Ivy League, excessive and unfair demands are being made on the time and energies of student-athletes.

5. That there is a distinct possibility that the realistic approach to the proposed study is (a) to recognize that the major problems are created by the policies of only about 50 institutions in the nation; (b) to accept the probability that those institutions are so deeply mired in tradition, community pressures, and financial commitment as to make it extremely difficult—if not impossible—for them to make significant changes in their policies; (c) to assume that the other 1500 or so colleges in the country which operate significant programs of intercollegiate athletics are eagerly awaiting leadership in charting a course leading to escape from attempts to be like the 50 and (d) to propose a plan which will attract the loyalty and cooperation of those institutions which wish to renounce the trappings of professionalism and maintain, or return to, programs which are an integral part of a balanced educational offering.

One final personal recommendation: when and if the Commission is formed, one of the required background readings should be an article[9] by Professor Harry A. Scott, formerly Professor of Health and Physical at Teachers College of Columbia University and later Head of the Department of Physical Education at the University of Oregon, Rice Institute and Brooklyn College. That article is by all odds the best brief statement I have seen related to what the proposed study is all about. Although written in 1956, its central thrust is as pertinent now as it was then. While the whole article merits most careful study, the following extended quotation goes to the heart of the matter:

> Some small colleges with inflated levels of aspiration conduct programs of athletics far larger than warranted by the number of students on the campus. Conversely, numerous institutions with enrollments numbering in the thousands conduct modest programs of intercollegiate athletics. It is distressing, but true, that the smaller colleges, athletically speaking, form the last frontier in the quest for a program of athletics that is consistent with and contributes to the goals of higher education. The larger institutions, athletics-wise, that traditionally have formed the spearhead of intercollegiate athletics in this country have long since passed the point where they can turn toward an educationally justifiable program of competitive sports. Even if they wished to do otherwise, they are now compelled to seek

---

[9] Scott, Harry A., "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics," Teachers College Record, Vol. 58, No. 1, October 1956.

> more rather than less power in athletics. Tremendous monetary commitments in facilities, equipment, and manpower are involved, to say nothing of conference-sanctioned commitments to bowl games and tie-ups with commercial television and radio interests.
>
> The wooing of off-campus support of athletics has developed into a large measure of control by vested outside interests that have little or no concern for the goals of higher education, for those who administer the educational programs, or for the young people who play the games. Although a press agent type of justification may be made by spokesmen for the big athletic powers, little genuine concern is evidenced as to where all this fits into higher education, or what happens to the youth who are caught up in this maze of contradictions. Unfortunately, these practices have tended to set the pattern which is diligently aped—at the starvation level in most cases—by many small colleges of the country.
>
> There is no earthly reason why colleges with modest athletic ambitions should not conduct programs of intercollegiate athletics that are educationally sound and justifiable. Most smaller colleges are relatively free from the aforementioned pressures; not by choice perhaps, but simply because few people seem to be interested in televising their contests, inviting them to participate in bowl or other post-season games, or in paying large sums at the gate to see their teams perform. These colleges, therefore, are in a better position to engage in serious soul-searching and programs of self-improvement than their more powerful brethren, athletically speaking, who, under faculty control and guidance it should be noted, have been caught up in the vicious cycle of so-called "big-time" athletics.[10]

A Commission which does a thorough job of bringing the descriptive functions of Bulletin 23 up to date, making a searching analysis of the economics of present day intercollegiate athletic programs, and formulating a proposal for remedial action based on thinking like Professor Scott's will have made an important contribution to the future of American education.

---

[10] Scott, op.cit., pp. 35-36.

# American College Athletics in Retrospect

## A Backward 1973 Look at the 1929 Report

*(This was Attachment 2 of a set of working papers produced by Mr. Hanford in July 1973. It is offered here as a single attachment in support of Mr. Ireland's report of March 1, 1974.)

As noted in the body of the proposal to which this document is an attachment, any evaluation of the efforts of the publication of American College Athletics is made difficult by the fact that the 1929 report was more descriptive than prescriptive. Such specific recommendations as it contains are generally tucked away in the text and not highlighted in a way that makes it easy to judge their effects. And any current evaluation is rendered even more difficult by the changes in external circumstances which have occurred in the past forty-four years; the conditions in 1973 provide a background for making judgements which is quite different from those of 1929. For one thing, life was much simpler in 1929. Except for baseball, professional sports were in their infancy. Amateurism was pure and absolute. Television was only an embryo. The civil rights movement was still more than 25 years away. Student bodies were homogeneous. Curriculum offerings were much less extensive and the liberal arts still held ascendancy. Despite these and other changes, however, a backward look should in any event be part of the record.

In its first two chapters, the 1929 report calls attention to the need for principles: for the "gradual establishment through concrete action of a few general principles to which all men agree in the abstract" and "not (for) uniformity of requirements respecting eligibility...but uniformity and recognition of fundamental principles." Suggested principles are never spelled out as such but, at the risk of gross and cryptic oversimplification, I would interpret them to be:

To espouse pure amateurism

To shun commercialism

To exorcise evil practices in the recruitment and subsidization of athletes.

To restore social values to sports.

To integrate intercollegiate athletics in the academic and social life of the institution.

To revitalize the intellectual challenge to the undergraduate and to fulfill these principles by:

Getting college and university presidents to take control.

Delegating responsibility for intercollege sports to undergraduates.

Encouraging more intramural athletics.

Returning to amateur coaching.

Protecting athletes' health.

Getting the sports press to mature.

In these terms, the record of subsequent accomplishment, except perhaps in the last two instances, has been poor.

Amateurism: The definition of amateurism in 1929 was clear and unequivocal. Today the definition is a complicated one which must be couched in terms of what in 1929 could only have been described as degrees of professionalism. For instance, how much subsidy can an athlete enjoy without becoming a professional. But even if the meaning of amateurism were clear, it is now questionable whether in the light of the civil rights movement, it is a convention which should be observed. Is not the concept antithetical to the principle of equality of opportunity?

Social Values: The jury is still out on the principle restoring social values to intercollegiate sports. However, the Carnegie Corporation files contain many present day calls for the restoration of desirable social values to the field of intercollegiate athletics which are couched in terms that are reminiscent of phrases in American College Athletics.

Integration of Sports: With respect to the fundamental question: Intercollegiate athletics and education, mutually inclusive or mutually exclusive? The 1929 report leaned virtually all the way toward the former. It did so on the grounds that sports, extra- or intra-mural, are part of the educational process whether the college or university involved considers itself primarily an intellectual institution or a socializing agency. Issue is not taken here with that earlier response. Note simply is taken of the fact that the question is still being seriously asked in 1973.

The intellectual challenge: The 1929 report comes down hard in favor of the traditional academic programs based on the liberal arts and hard not only against then emerging trends toward vocational or preprofessional programs but also against the open door admissions policies of many institutions, particularly in the Midwest. In coming down hard, it voiced the opinion that "the American college must renew within itself the force that will challenge the best intellectual capabilities of the undergraduate." In the event, circumstances conspired to cultivate just the opposite. Concerned for survival during the Depression and preoccupied with national defense during World War II, higher education found itself flooded, first with veterans and later with the war babies, and called upon to expand not only its facilities but the scope of its offerings. And then the civil rights movement legitimatized open admissions. Whether the failure to retreat to excellence was a contributory cause of higher education's inability to live up to the other principles espoused in American College Athletics or was a companion victim of other circumstances, no one is calling today for a return to academic excellence as a cure for the ills of intercollegiate athletics.

Presidential control: The AAU resolution in itself is specific evidence in support of the more general observation that, let alone seizing control of intercollegiate athletics, college and university presidents have tended to abdicate their responsibilities and to leave them to the professionals in the field. Such added controls as have been introduced have tended to be imposed by conferences and associations.

Student responsibility: If anything, students have, except in a few instances, been losing authority over and responsibility for intercollegiate athletics.

Intramural sports: There is little evidence to go on here. Yet one does not sense a great surge in this direction. This is an area that warrants a close look.

Amateur coaching: Coaching has, if anything, become more professional, particularly in the sense that the external conferences and associations, especially the NCAA, have tended to professionalize the field.

On the last two points, relating to health and to the press, it can be said that they, perceived as serious problem areas in the 1929 study, are generally absent from current expressions of concern. While it can hopefully be inferred that conditions have improved in response to the exhortations of forty-four years ago, it is, in the light of the current flap in the professional sports, surprising not to have found widespread concern over the use of drugs. And while the nation's sports press may have matured, television has added a new dimension of related concern.

GHH/mb
July 1973

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amdur, Neil, The Fifth Down (New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1972).

Ebel, Kenneth, "Head, Heart and Hand Outstretched," Columbia University Forum, Fall, 1960.

Ford, Jeremiah, II, "Not Just Entertaining Sideshows," The Pennsylvania Gazette, October 1966.

Governali, Paul, "The Physical Educator as Coach," Quest, December 1966

Griswold, A. Whitney, "The Best of Two Worlds: Athletics and Education," Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal (New Haven: Yale University Press, Inc., 1962).

Gutman, Bill, The Hockey Explosion (New York: Grosset & Dunlap, Inc., 1973).

Marco, S. M., "The Place of Intercollegiate Athletics in Higher Education," The Journal of Higher Education, November 1960.

Meggyesy, Dave, Out of Their League (Berkeley: Ramparts Press, 1970).

Savage, Howard J., American College Athletics (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1929).

Scott, Harry A., "New Directions in Intercollegiate Athletics," Teachers College Record, Vol. 58, No. 1, October, 1956.

Scott, Jack, The Athletic Revolution (New York: The Free Press, 1971).

Shaw, Gary, Meat on the Hoof (New York: Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1973).

Talami, John T., and Page, Charles H., editors, Sport and Society (Boston-Toronto: Little Brown and Company, 1973).

APPENDIX G

# CAMPUS, SOCIETY, AND THE PLACE OF AMATEUR SPORT:

## A RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

March 7, 1974

Theodore J. Lowi

## CAMPUS, SOCIETY, AND THE PLACE OF AMATEUR SPORT:

## A RESEARCH PERSPECTIVE

The value of sport in the life of a nation has not gone unnoticed. For well over two centuries sport has had its partisans who will hear no evil of it. And it has had its critics who seem unable or unwilling to appreciate its functions. But they have one thing in common, and that is their appreciation for the importance and the near ubiquity of sport.

Sport may take the form of "bread and circuses" in a declining empire or mass calisthenics in an empire aborning. In the West, sport has tended primarily to mean competitive sport, involving primarily competition between human beings, directly against each other or against an existing record of previous achievement. This definition may even include modern hunting and trapping, although the French do make a useful distinction between sport, chasse, and jeux.

The value of sport must be approached on at least two levels. Sport has value to the individual participant, and it has value to the regime -- that is, those persons who have the right and feel the obligation to concern themselves about society.

To the individual, sport serves psychological as well as physical needs. Since sport is organized play, it requires the development of a super-ego. Sport integrates the individual into the collective in a way that reinforces individuality while at the same time enabling the individual to deal with his peers and with the broader unknowns of society. Sport reaffirms individual ego, awakens the energies to assert oneself, and imposes simultaneously a sense of the social context of individuality.*

Modern sport is tied to modern nation-states. Historians tend to agree that until the 18th century it was difficult to distinguish sport from battle, games from war games, and the association never was broken even though sport became more humane and formal.

In the early 18th century the British upper classes began to play cricket, and by the end of that century cricket was to become a national sport, perhaps the first national sport. On the way, sport began to spread to other classes and to establish rules governing manner and style of play. French observers were delicious in their reports of the brutality of play in the island. Even toward the end of the 18th century French observers were still denouncing the British as "bestial, given, from highest to lowest on the social scale, to excess at table and cabaret." And it is true that French games were more civilized. But they were also a great deal more restricted to the upper classes and nobility. Access to sport in France was limited virtually to those who enjoyed access to that corner building in the Palais du Louvre that takes its name, jeu de paume, from a favorite French sport (a form of handball).

The spread of access to sport came with the spread of the spirit of democracy and universal human rights. Sport is a reflection of that spirit and, many feel, makes a great contribution to it. Certainly the British people will agree to that point of view. The British did not discover sport, but it was the British educators who first learned how to utilize sport as an integral part of the education of the youth. It formally begins in 1828, when Thomas Arnold, dean of the College of Rugby from 1828 to 1842, decided to try out his theory that sport was a necessary part of the process of educating individuals to the desirable moral qualities, such as a sense of responsibility in social life.

---

*There is a voluminous literature on this aspect of the subject, written largely by friends of sport. A brief but comprehensive review will be found in Bernard Gillet, Histoire du sport (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1948). A classic essay is that of G.H. Mead, "Play, the Game and the Generalized Other," full citation to be provided.

But this immediately gets us to the second level in a consideration of the value of sport. Once the theory becomes widespread that sport does contribute something to the desirable moral qualities of the youth, sport inevitably becomes important to the regime inasmuch as it might be used as a device for the deliberate instilling of these virtues. Thus, from almost the point at which sport comes to be widely accessible is also seized upon as a mechanism of deliberate civic training.*It is this level of the problem which shall concern us in this paper. The level of sport and individuality is of tremendous importance, and insights about that relationship spill over into research that needs to be done on sport at the societal level. However, the more microscopic level should be left to psychologists and social psychologists who have the conceptual and research

---

*See Charles Merriam, Civic Training in America, University of Chicago Press, full citation ~~to be provided.~~

abilities to deal with it.

## Sport and the Regime

The relationship between sport and the regime was probably never stated more precisely than by Wellington's opinion that the battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. It is no coincidence that those British educators who sought to make sport an integral part of public school and university life supported their theories in terms of those virtues that were most desired by the state. Responsibility to society meant identification with the prevailing values of the real society of the times. The rules that help develop super-egoes are part of the system of rules and rule-makers that require loyalty. Early British practices are especially interesting because they are so clearly related to social needs, and also because they were so directly influential upon patterns that were to develop in the United States. First of all, the British developed team sports. The top universities were located in the countryside, where there were fields for team play and urges to develop local loyalties. But these conditions fed into other goals as well. A team was a special and separate, tightly-knit group. It met together and elected its own captain. During the period of play, each member of the team was expected to be blindly loyal to the captain and to the requirements of the team.

Cricket is of course a team sport, but the premier examples are nevertheless football (soccer) and rugby. It has been reported that rubgy was invented by accident when a mischevious student at the

College of Rugby seized the football in his hands and ran with it instead of kicking it. The game spread despite the opposition of the educational elite, based on fear that such a game meant the return of savage sports of the pre-18th century. These aggressive team sports did indeed spread and were recognized within one generation as national sports. The Football Association was founded in 1863 and the Rugby Union in 1871 to make rules and regulations for national participation. At the very same time the two associations recognized the development of professional teams and encouraged them while keeping them separate from amateur teams.

This brings us closer to the present problem. First, we see the spread of access to sport toward virtual universality. Sport became one of the most important means by which society could reach across class and regional distinctions. At the same time we see in the Anglo-American history that amateur sport takes its national rooting in and develops its strongest foundation in the colleges and universities. Third, especially through the two most vigorous team sports of football and rugby, we see the development of perhaps the most important aspect of sport today, spectator sport. It is through spectator sport that we get the ultimate fusion of all important sport -- from the standpoint of the regime. This includes the historically important sport of boxing and the more recently important individual sports -- that are forcibly converted into team sports by cumulative national scoring -- in the Olympic Games.

The 19th century was probably the beginning and the end of universal participatory sport. Participation is still universally encouraged as part of the educational curriculum through the earliest grades to at least the college freshman year. But apparently from the standpoint of school budgets themselves and from the standpoint of the regime, spectator sport has become a good deal more important.

As a spectator activity, sport is a form of entertainment -- a consumer activity in a consumer society. It can be usefully compared and contrasted to the theater. A spectator sport has entertainment value to the individual. It will obviously not be consumed unless it has entertainment value, because it is rare if ever that attendance at a sports spectacle is obligatory. Thus, as entertainment it is as much a part of the history of theater as it is of the history of sport. But the comparison is not fair. Serious theater is an educational as well as an entertainment medium. Theater is educational because it seeks to question values. To "hold the mirror up to nature" is to call for reanalysis of old values and consideration of alternatives. In contrast, the purpose of entertainment is to reaffirm and to reinforce existing values. A lot of what happens in theater -- i.e. Broadway -- is mere entertainment in this sense. But almost all spectator sport is entertainment. And it is entertainment of a very special sort because of the particular values that can be reinforced through spectator sport.

This is why the second dimension of the value of sport looms so large for spectator sport. To the individual spectator, sport of course has the value already ascribed to it. But this value to the individual usually is substitutable by other consumer items. Spectator sport is in constant competition against substitutable entertainment and there is always great pressure to innovate by adding spectacle to the sport, by changing the rules to make the game more interesting, by developing heroes and a regular star system, and by enhancing community identification. There is a never ending pressure to spread consumption and to defend the skills and the other vested interests in a particular sport by making the demand for it less and less elastic (i.e. less substitutable with some other unit of value). Part of this is of course the effort to make the particular sport easier to consume by improving the stadium, the access, the parking, and of course by using television and other methods of reproduction. All of this is to say that the incentive to spread sport toward universality is perhaps even stronger in the spectator than in the participant sport.

This is apparently also trueas regards the regime, because the value of spectator sport to the regime is far greater than the value of spectator sport to the individual consumer. Indeed one could say that spectator sport is more important than participant sport, except for the fact that the former is prerequisite to the latter. Moreover, spectator sport is less substitutable a commodity for the regime. Although anything we say at this point is entirely hypothetical, it would seem that spectator sport provides a country with common symbols, common experiences, common focus, and a sense of common destiny that is hard to match with any other peaceful social process. And spectator sport is in many respects more important than ever before. This is not because modern man is more sporting or more primitive, but because of the decline of other, substitutable channels toward national integration and the national inculcation of certain valuable norms and behaviors.

Religion, for example, has perhaps been the most important channel for the inculcation of common values. But it seems to be ever weaker in the large industrial nation-states. One does not have to condemn the substance of a religion to recognize the ups and downs of the place of religion in the great design of social stability and political integration. And it says nothing against religion to recognize that it was a deliberate instrument in the hands of the great unifiers and conquerers. Is it mere coincidence that the age of the great roman and gothic cathedrals was also an age of crumbled empires, crumbling communities, and a desperate search for some basis of community integration?

Perhaps the most important reason for the weakening of religion as a force for integration was the emergence of war as the great modern unifier. A threat from outside the community imposes a sense of common destiny and a desire to commit oneself to higher symbols and an identity larger than oneself. And here again, one can admire liberalism and democracy while at the same time recognizing that the great wars involving the mobilization of all the people were wars of national liberation fought in the name of democracy, independence, individual rights, representative government, and so on.

Neither should it degrade sport to compare it to war, religion, and other devices used by the national elites to gain national political stability. Spectator sport is to a very great extent an example of William James' "moral equivalent of war." Jousting may be the last use of sport as a moral replacement for war; but the integrative value of big spectator sport is unmistakably present and in use in all modern nation-states.

This is not to say that sport is created by the regime as a matter of public policy. Sport is too fundamental an experience to be something a regime can create and instill. Susceptibility to competition, to rules, to identification with teams, and emotional rapport with anthems and other symbols of identification and differentiation must already exist in the society. Regimes simply discover these susceptibilities, encourage them, and use them as channels of social integration and that pure and simple loyalty called patriotism.

And it should be emphasized that all modern regimes recognize the political value of sport. Only the form seems to vary. Marxists have always looked for opiates-for-the-people and have indeed caught capitalist regimes red-handed, if Marxists will pardon the expression. But so skillfully and concertedly have the Marxists been analyzing the capitalist camp that they have missed a few details in their own backyard -- or back lot. Every revolution, Left and Right, is almost necessarily followed by a concerted regime policy of "making the new man." Like it or not, the new regime has to employ existing channels and existing emotional tendencies to reorient and reintegrate the population. Simply put, the character of a people does not change over night; the people must be appealed to in old ways in order to change to new values.

The importance to the Nazi regime of the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games has been frequently noted. Throughout that period in Germany war and sport were intermingled in unprecendented ways with perhaps unprecedented intensity in order to achieve total integration. But this experience only differs in degree from the experience of other countries. A regime could hardly be more serious than that of the Soviet Union about international athletic competition. Perhaps this has come to be stressed all the more since the death of Stalin and the liberalization of controls. One very worthwhile inquiry to make would be one into the Soviet budget for sport. It would surely confirm the frustrated accusations of the U.S. Olympic officials that Soviet Olympic athletes are virtually employed by the government to spend full time on their sport.

But Americans, who may be unquestionably more honest in their obedience to the spirit of the rules of amateur status, have nevertheless been important in making political hay out of international amateur competition.

Once these sobering observations are made, however, it should also be noted that these countries are not departing all that far from the philosophy back of the resumption of the Olympic Games in the 1890's. The difference of degree may be just enough to corrupt the whole original idea, but difference of degree it is, as the following case will suggest.

The "philosophy" of the modern Olympics as enunciated by its founder, Pierre de Coubertin, seems to have been composed of several parts. First, as with the ancient Olympic view, modern Olympic philosophy allied the athlete with religion. In a sense each athlete pays honor to God in our day, as he paid honor to the gods in ancient Greece. M. Coubertin made quite explicit his expectation that this would be tied together with the exaltation of the country, the race, and the flag of each athlete.

The second characteristic of the philosophy of the modern Olympics was that it was composed of an aristocracy, an elite. The difference is that this is an elite that was to be "totally egalitarian," since it was determined by achievement and not by personal favor or corporate control. The third characteristic of the philosophy was that this was an elite of chevaliers -- that is, it was an elite of brothers in arms, an elite fraternity or camaraderie of shared difficulty and shared privation.

The fourth characteristic in the philosophy of the modern Olympics was that the days of the confrontation were to be a kind of armistice among all nations, during which international passions and political competitions were set aside.*

---

*Two other elements complete the story, but are less important simply because they fail to take hold. One of these was the stress of the founder on male competition -- he did not anticipate nor did he favor the involvement of women. Fortunately this did not last. And finally there was the element of art and of beauty, upon which he attached some hope that a real school of arts and letters would become attached to the Olympic process.

One can see from the primary characteristics of the foundation of modern Olympic competition that the involvement of the flag and the use of cumulative scoring to aggrandize national pride are not all that terribly far removed. Just as the beauty of the ancient knight did not have to become tied up with armies and national wars, so did the Olympics not have to become tied up with international realpolitik. But in both instances the tendencies were there and available for manipulation by national elites.

America's involvement with spectator sport is consistent with history but about as serious as can be found anywhere, and a good deal more serious than in most nations. Individual spectators are not more intense than in other countries, considering the vicious fighting that sometimes breaks out during a Latin American soccer match. Indeed there are palaces of sport all over sophisticated Europe where great sporting spectacles can and do take place. But the involvement of Americans and American leaders in sport could hardly be outmatched in any other country. And perhaps the most important, at least the most revealing, expression of American involvement in athletics will be found in the college and university system in the country, even though the national regime as such is almost completely out of the picture.

## The American Campus and American Society

The United States holds a special place in the annals of higher education, and amateur sport holds a special, almost unique place within the American system. We did not invent college sport or college spectator sport. The British did, if anyone specifically invented it. But as usual, we took somebody else's invention and pushed it to the limit of its possibilities. In any event, it would be impossible to appreciate the role of sport in American society outside the context of American colleges and universities.

Perhaps the best way to approach this complex relationship is first to understand where American higher education has come from and how at each stage of its development it has adjusted itself to the problems of society.

TABLE I.* EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS AND CLASS INTERESTS

| EDUCATIONAL NORM | EDUCATIONAL ETHIC | SOCIAL INTEREST REPRESENTED | FORM OF SOCIAL INTEGRATION |
|---|---|---|---|
| Classical education (classic Church education). | Consumer ethic: "knowledge for its own sake" (knowledge for personal discipline). | aristocracy | community |
| Liberal arts education | Consumer ethic: "Renaissance man," "genteel erudition" | old bourgeoisie | fraternity |
| Disciplinary education | Producer ethic: "the Ph.D.," "the major" | new middle classes-professional salariat | society |
| Practical education | Training ethic:* "A & M," "experience" | working classes | estate |
| Technocratic education | Problem-solving ethic: "the multiversity," "service" | regimes | corps |

*The recent revival of training schools is a curious one, containing a mix of junior colleges and radical "free universities" as well as courses inside four-year colleges. It also includes some courses specifically designed for black studies; however, the growing emphasis in black studies programs on consciousness and cultural nationalism is actually a liberal arts norm and is already dominated by the black middle classes. What, after all, is traditional liberal arts but "white studies"?

---

*Do not reproduce this table without permission of the author.

Table I is a schematic summary of these major developments. Each phase of development is represented by a dominant "educational norm" (the first column) and appears to be dedicated to one outstanding ethic or goal (second column). For reasons of space and time, these two columns will not be directly treated in this paper. More time must be reserved for the other two columns.*

The third column on Table I is intended to capture the one most important aspect of the relationship between universities and society by identifying the dominant interest or social class to which each type of university is attached and for which it provides the largest part of its services. This is not intended to suggest that the particular social class or interest actually dictated the type of university in question, or that the particular social class in any way "caused" one of the educational norms to come into being. These things are too large and encompass too much time to be that self-conscious and deliberate. This relationship between a university system and a social interest is rather one between any service agency and its clientele. A certain kind of university will simply take root and prosper if it has a social base; if it loses its social base or becomes irrelevant to the needs of its original social base it is likely to wither. In a functional sense, each university does in fact "serve" the class or interest in question. But "symbiosis" is actually a more accurate word than service.

---

*A longer treatment of these particular issues, though not dealing with sport as such, will be found in two places: Lowi, The Politics of Disorder (New York: Basic Books, 1971), Chapter 6; and Lowi, "The Politics of Higher Education: Political Science as a Case Study," in George Graham and George Carey (eds.), The Post Behavioral Era (New York: David McKay, 1973), Chapter 1.

The fourth column on the Table is intended to provide strong emphasis to the socio-political importance of each educational norm or system, for here we see that even the most individual and personal aspects of "campus life" have always tended to be shaped by the prevailing institutional relationship between the university and social classes and regimes. This is the column that deserves our closest attention in developing a design for research into athleticism.

In the aristocratic system of university education, persons of the same community associated with each other in terms of their superiority of status and of learning, and of almost every other value as well. This university was merely an extension of the society. The student brought his community standing over into the university, and his associates all did the same thing. They tended to be well-acquainted with each other in both contexts, and it was probably difficult to know when one status ended and the other began. More often than not, students were of far higher standing than their professors -- and in many places they had a great influence on the hiring and firing of faculty. But the point here is that the university was in and of the community, had no particular identity except in those terms, and tended to justify itself as the keeper, defender, and distributor of the existing cultural heritage. (Note the characteristics listed briefly under "educational ethic.")

These characteristics of the aristocratic university were not pushed out altogether as new classes and new interests came into play. But they were overshadowed, and the university did have to adjust. The coming of the bourgeoisie involved a new interest to which the university had to adjust in some fundamental ways. Indeed the adjustment was made, but it quite clearly involved changes in the way in which the university would integrate itself with society and satisfy society sufficiently to justify continuing financial and political support. What would seem most clearly to have happened in the switch from the aristocratic to the original bourgeois base is that the relationship between the campus and the society became somewhat more narrow. There would never again be a stable relationship between the whole campus and the entire upper class structure of the society at large. This expressed itself on the campus in terms of distinctions made along class lines between students. Perhaps this is most dramatically and concretely seen in the exclusiveness of the aristocratic secret societies in the Ivy League colleges. Eventually, most students adjusted to this special and invidious kind of heterogeneity by finding persons of their own kind, persons whom they did not know prior to their coming on campus, but who seemed to share the same values and goals. These were the fraternities. They took hold because they provided a specialized way by which the now unlike elements of the student body could stay together and yet apart. As a consequence, social class hostility was probably accentuated inside the colleges and universities. But the basis for living with that heightened alienation and the basis for maintaining peaceful relations in the society at large, were certainly provided by the fraternity approach.

The emergence of education based upon disciplines and organized fields clearly constitutes a third revolution in the history of American higher education, one that is perhaps even more clearly than the other two associated with changes in the class structure of the society. The disciplinary basis of education was introduced before the great expansion of the "new middle classes," but it was a system of education that could prosper best in such a universe of values. The new middle classes were primarily composed of people Robert Dahl would call the "ex-plebes," persons whose families had already experienced a certain amount of social mobility and then turned their children to college as a way to complete the fulfillment of the American Dream. For students who were secure in a long inheritance of status and wealth, the liberal arts education and the consumer ethic were worthwhile. But the same orientation toward genteel erudition did not have so broad an appeal among the newly professionalizing classes. For them the liberal arts might be something worth cultivating after a discipline was acquired and a career assured. And the disciplinary approach was a good one for adjusting the university to changes in its class and educational composition, because the disciplines can coexist with and tolerate other educational norms. Each of the classical and liberal refinements can be allowed to continue to exist as "majors." And that is not as neat and simple as it sounds. It took quite a revolution, precisely because the relationship could not exist the other way around. That is, to the classicist or the humanist, Plato cannot be departmentalized. The hostility of the refined subjects and their professors continues on into our day.*

A bit more will be said in a moment about the fourth and fifth phases of university development, practical education and technocratic education. For the moment it suffices to say that these two changes only highlight the problems of integration between college and society that we are already able to perceive with the full emergence of the disciplinary system. Let us turn immediately to some of those consequences in order to get as quickly as possible to the purpose of this particular inquiry, the role of amateur sport.

One can fairly easily perceive four basic consequences of the emergence of American universities as fully heterogeneous, multi-class faculties and student bodies. (1) The severing of faculty from students and from society; (2) the severing of students from their communities and thence from society; (3) the severing of students from each other; and, as a residuum of those, (4) the severing of the university as an institution from the society at large. A word on each of these is in order, because the place of amateur sport as a compensation or complement for each is highly variable.

---

*One of the most interesting expressions of this problem will be found in the history of the University of Chicago under Robert Hutchins. Chicago had taken the disciplinary approach to its extreme at the time Hutchins became president in 1929 or 1930. Hutchins tried to change and undermine this system of hyperspecialization by pitting the undergraduate College against the specialized departments of the Graduate School at Chicago. The Hutchins experiment did not outlast even the Hutchins presidency, and it was not widely copied, even though it was universally studied. Why? An important reason for this was that, for all its good intentions, the College at Chicago was a throwback to a pattern of educational service to higher classes that were simply not sufficiently numerous to sustain it.

One of the most important, and perhaps the healthiest, of these developments in the modern university is the loosening and weakening of ties between faculty and students. As the average status of the student declined, the average social standing of the professors increased, not only in relation to the declining status of the student but absolutely in terms of the honor given to this profession in the society. The association between students and faculty came to be formal and distant, exaggerated all the more by the increasing size of classes in mass universities. Of equal importance was the emergence of learned societies. Professors simply found their own social base. This gave professors organizational muscle to defend themselves in the name of academic freedom, and it also gave them a reference group far larger and more distant than the university proper. This meant greater productivity, greater economic value, far greater political power. But it certainly meant severance within the specific university where a professor happened to be teaching.

In parallel fashion students became increasingly removed from their original communities and from their original class positions. This too has its healthy aspect. For the first time in the lives of most students, going away to college was an opportunity to find a new identity, to experiment with new roles, and to pursue interests that were either discouraged back home or were not conceived of at all. From the economic standpoint it was even more important that students from lower middle classes who had few meaningful economic connections could begin to make those connections and to establish their own basis for a lifetime career. This is another way of stating the particular attractions of a disciplinary education for the "ex-plebes." But there is a dilemma in this for the student and for the concerned society. Indeed a true education, as suggested earlier, requires a serious reanalysis of existing values and the freedom to change values if that seems called for. But at the same time, the fate of the university is doomed if it does not also integrate the student by making him a productive member of a society he will join once he leaves the campus.

This is such a tough problem for many university administrators that they have tried to find a way out of the disciplinary system. And this is where the fifth unit on Table I comes into play, particularly in the past decade or two. The "technocratic education" is a variant of the disciplinary system. It utilizes existing disciplines, but it changes the goal. Technocratization forges a new connection between the university and society along vocational lines. It takes the disciplines and reshapes them by giving them increased ability to solve specific social problems. The origin of the discipline lies in its orientation toward cognitive ordering. A success in disciplinary education is the acquisition of existing knowledge and the furtherance of that knowledge through research and analysis. The ability to solve problems is an intellectual one, and it is justified in terms of the enhanced ability of the student to take on a variety of problems when he goes out into the real world. Technocratization, on the other hand, redesigns certain of the disciplines so that there is more of a guarantee that the discipline is oriented toward some basic problems and thus toward some existing business or governmental institution that is set up to deal with those problems. The French have carried this system farthest by actually designing whole universities, called the Grandes Ecoles, whose products are oriented toward specific occupations. These are actually high-powered trade schools whose products dominate the personnel of specific government agencies and the businesses. (More on this particular "solution" later.)

The third result flows rather directly from the others. Those who like it call it student freedom, those who don't like it call it alienation. Both are essentially correct. The severing of students from each other does indeed enhance the freedom of each student to make new friends and cut out new roles for himself. But it can make life very dull and grey for students who do not make friends easily and who do not wish to be so far severed from their old friends, their old values, or original communities. In this kind of context students often "act like children" Indeed, from the standpoint of what they are in the process of acquiring, they are children.

All of these add up to a severing of the university from the society at large. The university became its own society. As a tendency, this is true of smaller colleges as well as larger universities. Neither faculty members nor students are extensions of some outside social class any more. For better or worse, they have each other in a system of maximum choice and minimum tradition.

The multi-class "multiuniversity" became a real problem of social integration. None of this necessarily describes a pathology. Quite the contrary, the great American university is a magnificent opportunity for individual freedom and for the collective academic freedom to pursue knowledge wherever it might be found. But this kind of magnificent opportunity does not come free, and aside from the expense of sustaining it there is also a problem of protecting society against it. Even the most hardbitten supporters of academic freedom and university autonomy have been willing to consider various ways to make the student happier. Most are even willing to discuss ways of making the university more productive in terms of the need of society for social stability and reaffirmation. Disagreements among policy makers inside and outside the university are intense, however, because every conceivable proposal to re-integrate the university with society is treated by some as a solution and by others as a pathology. For example, there may still be some who would view the holding of chapel as a very nice way to keep the university productively at peace with society. But there is hardly a faculty or a student body left in the United States who would not shout this proposal down. Nevertheless, a few responses to heterogeneity, alienation, and severence have been contrived, and these are worth considering -- again for purposes of putting amateur sport in its proper context.

The problem of class heterogeneity and alienation was met in part by fraternities. There is hardly a major university campus that was not called a "fraternity school" by someone. And in part to confirm the function of fraternities, it should be observed that they were a good deal less important in the liberal arts colleges, largely because of the very homogeneity of the entire student body in those places.

However, fraternities were never a complete answer, even during the 1930's through the 1950's when they were in their heyday. Harvard and Yale tried to answer the question of moderate class heterogeneity (basically regional heterogeneity in those schools) in the 1930's by building the "colleges" and the "houses." Their hope was that each of these places would be combined teaching and residential places that would ultimately develop a sufficient amount of real social integration. But somehow the class jealousies tended to express themselves, leaving the residential system somewhat at sixes and sevens. Very early in the game Princeton tried to disperse the so-called eating clubs; and Yale never managed to root out the real exclusiveness of the old family and "old boy" relationships upon which these secret societies and certain of the most exclusive fraternities were based. This was considered a substandard kind of human integration, and its problems seemed to increase at something like an exponential rate as one moved from the Ivy campuses to the larger state colleges, to the enormous Big Ten universities and to the new universities of the post World War II period that grew so tremendously fast with uprooted people of all ages and backgrounds from all over the country.

Every college and university tried to experiment with things over which the administration itself might have some control -- considering that once the fraternity system was established it did its good and its bad things regardless of the wishes of the corporate university system itself. These administratively sponsored approaches to integration took several forms, and, thanks to imitation, were pretty much the same throughout the country -- and still are. In general I would call these "administered social relations."

One of the most interesting aspects of this is the transformation of the Dean of Students from a disciplinary office to a Big Brother type of function. A related aspect of this, sometimes under the authority of the Dean of Students and sometimes separate, is the rise of psychological services. There is usually a staff of professional psychologists and a rather larger staff of trained counselors. The whole history of administered relations in colleges deserves careful attention not only by those interested in social psychology but by anyone who is concerned about the present and future function of higher education as a channel of social mobility. We know very little about the real consequences of deliberate efforts to democratize populations over a short period of time.

In any case, there are still other fairly uniform reactions of universities to their heterogeneous and somewhat alienated situation. One of the more interesting ones is the student union movement. Beginning at Cornell with Willard Straight Hall, most campuses developed student centers. If they began in a small expendable house, usually ready for condemnation, they spread quickly through the tremendous demand for their services, ranging from barbershops to billard rooms. After World War II, no self-respecting campus would be caught dead without a very large and elaborate student center. These continue to perform important functions for the campus, but they are rather economic and objective in nature, and have not really provided the kind of integration inside the campus or between campus and society that the bigger universities seem to need. In fact, student unions have tended to exacerbate "town-gown relations" by frequently being guilty of merely offering services at an unfair competitive advantage. But this has not discouraged the growth of student unions. Rather, most college administrations continue to plan for the expansion of unions, hoping to find a secret combination of student activities that will become fashionable and attractive to otherwise disoriented students. This kind of thing has become so large in some places that separate and rather large buildings just for "student activities" have been built because the student union is too small to accommodate them or because the student union is too busy with the provision of ordinary services. Either way, this is an effort of importance in the history of modern, democratized universities in the United States.

A more recent response that has gained tremendously in popularity in the past five or six years is the reverse of all this, the changing of rules and dormitory arrangements so as to allow students the privacy and the opportunity to develop their own communities and their own primary groups. There was always a lot of this in college. Most of the lasting friendships for many people are those that were made during the four years of college life. But opportunities were usually very much restricted to the accident of original placement in dormitories, or to the early choice, usually accidental or haphazard, of fraternity or upper class living arrangements. Under present conditions, usually encouraged by university deans, it is a good deal easier to switch around between living quarters and sexes in order to find one's own preferred living arrangement and one's own preferred type of adjustment to the atomization of college life. This of course has its advantages. But it is in a great sense an admission that it is not possible for universities to integrate themselves or to integrate institutionally with the larger society. Where this is taking us is difficult to say. But it could easily take us into a political crisis where state legislatures will begin to balk at providing the enormous financial support that the universities will need in the future. For, after all, the problem with integration is not only one of historic adjustment between university and society; it is also a short-range political problem of how to survive the next fiscal year.

More recent adjustments may provide something of an answer, but the price is enormously high. The type of adjustment in question is the reorganization or the reorientation of the university toward new educational norms. These are represented by the fourth and fifth types on Table I. Mention has already been made of the fifth one, and it is certainly the most important wave of experimentation going on today. These two educational norms can be evaluated from several standpoints, and I have tried some of them in other publications.* The only point that needs to be made about them here is that they do represent a particular form of social integration. The form in both instances is an effort to integrate by the job or by the skill. That is, one reorganizes the university and its curriculum in order to provide students with precisely the kind of skill that a particular kind of job calls for. This means that they can begin to identify with their future careers very early, and that is likely to provide them with some sociological substance even during the period before they leave school. This may be more important than the sense of economic security it may give them.

This is a double-edged alternative. Indeed it offers a modest guarantee of economic security in the long-range future coupled with a very substantial guarantee of psychological reinforcement in the interim. But it comes at the price of technocratization of society that we can well evaluate by looking at the French. It can easily derange the existing attitude of faculty toward the obligation to search for knowledge. Practical problem solving under these two systems of education is not entirely comfortable with the "uselessness" of the disciplinary or the liberal arts or the classical approaches. But it could become so attractive as a form of social integration and as a way for corporations to cut costs in training executive personnel that it may become a force that will revolutionize the universities and colleges as we know them. (Further evaluation in op. cit.)

---

*Op. cit.

Out of all these considerations, college sport emerges. And it emerges as a rather important force in the heterogeneous university of the 20th century. Except perhaps for technocratization, which has not fully come yet, the methods that university administrators have worked out appear to be rather flimsy. In the past 50 years, college sport may have always been the most vital and practical of the arrangements to solve problems for campus life and to keep society happy with its university systems.

But all this is hypothetical. We simply do not know the precise role that sport has played in solving the immense problems of college life in the democratic eta. Thus, we cannot be sure of what we are gaining when we emphasize it further or what we would be losing if we decided to de-emphasize it. The situation with amateur college sport enters a crisis every decade or so. We are in such a crisis now, and a good deal of time and money are likely to be spent before we either make a decision or live through the crisis without changing anything. But perhaps the crisis is cyclical because we lack real information. Almost everybody in a position of responsibility has an opinion, because everybody is a product of one of these places or another. And the opinion of each person is well-founded up to a point, because it represents real experience over a four or more year, intense period of interaction. But if there was ever an appropriate moment to evoke the image of the blind men describing the elephant, this is it. Individual experiences with college sport and with the costs and gains of it are simply not cumulative.

What we need to do at this point is to bring together the two separate strains of this paper in a comprehensive research perspective. There is of course the whole history and philosophy of amateur sport. And there is of course the whole history and philosophy of higher education in a democratically oriented United States. What questions will best bring the two things together, so that new information on the one will redound to the benefit of both? The remainder of this paper will be in the form of questions that seem to be most deserving of research probes. And to repeat, the criterion of a good question is one that produces information that bears directly on these two dimensions: sport itself, and the place of sport in the future of our troubled universities.

1. Perhaps the most pressing need is for a concerted research effort into the history of sport in terms of its relation to the democratizing process in the universities. My hypothesis would be that the two arose together, have always been intimately associated, and in an important functional sense needed each other.

Here it is extremely important to keep a clear distinction between participatory and spectator sport. All American colleges and universities have required some kind of "physical education" during most of their histories. Moreover, programs of intramural sport have always tried to develop as broad a base in the student body as possible. But participatory sport pre-dates the democratic university by a very long time. In fact, participatory sport probably came closer to universal involvement in the upper class 18th and 19th century British institutions than in today's great universities of the lumpenbourgeoisie.

It is spectator sport that has probably had the parallel growth with the increase in size and the democratization of the American universities. And on this sort of thing information would be very easy to get. We need data on two dimensions of the university's history. One would be the over-time development in budgetary allocation for sport programs, fieldhouses and stadiums and the like, etc. This would be related to the history of the size of the student body, the overall budget for faculty, administration, student activities, etc.

From the standpoint of the basest sort of politics, there is likely to be a relationship, in that winning football and baseball teams have probably inspired state legislators to give larger budgets to the state university. And in earlier communications I had suggested that this relationship be explored. But there is also a relationship at the higher level of politics, in terms of the mere existence of spectator sport programs and facilities in relation to the two or three important ways of measuring university growth.

2. We not only want to know the gross relationship between the two. We also need to explore the substantive aspect of the relationship.

That is to say, we would like to explore as directly as possible the particular messages being communicated by the medium of spectator sports. This is extremely difficult to get at, as is true of all "media research." It might be fun to get some ideas from media researchers like Marshall McLuhan, but the type of thing that needs to be observed is fairly patent. I like to call it hero and anti-hero research. We need to analyze the outstanding players in the most important spectator sports at major universities. This is usually football, but it varies tremendously from region to region and from school size to school size. In effect we need to "content analyze" the heroes and anti-heroes in order to identify and assess the symbols they project and the symbols we expect them to project.

On the lighter side of this issue we can cite James Thurber's hysterically funny short story, "The Greatest Man in the World." Thurber's hero had accomplished a feat of such gigantic heroism in the late 1930's that he had totally overshadowed such accomplishments as that of Charles Lindbergh. However, to the horror of the President and the generals and the other top people, the hero had done all of this merely to gain the fame, the money, and the girls. The elite kept him in a hotel room for hour after hour while the crowds clamored to pay him honor out in the streets. The elite were trying to encourage him to play the proper role, by saying he owed it all to his mother, he did it for his country, etc. etc. But our hero would have none of it. After every session, even one with the President, he simply repeated his base lusts. At one point of desperation, when our hero was leaning over the balcony waving to his hysterical followers below, the generals and the admirals looked at each other and the President, they all shrugged knowingly, and one of them proceeded to push our hero over the balcony.

We are all aware of some real and serious counterparts to the Thurber hero. There is no question in my mind, for example, that much of the persecution of Mohammad Ali is due to his unwillingness to project the expected symbols of heroic athletic accomplishment in the United States. And we will certainly find this to be the case of our many black amateur athletes on the present college teams. In fact, we live in a time that is especially opportune for hero research, precisely because a larger number than ever have decided, completely without sophistication, to play some role other than that which has been expected. This is a perfect time to assess what is expected, and that gets us closer than anything else to a study of sport and patriotism in general, sport and university society in particular.

3. A not-unrelated piece of research would be in the area of what I would call "the follow-up of God and Man at Yale." As most people over the age of 35 will recall, William Buckley wrote a book, God and Man at Yale, almost immediately upon his graduation in 1950. His argument was of course that a place like Yale was destroying most of the Christian values, and that this was almost systematically happening because of the university policy of hiring liberals on the faculty. It is very probable that Buckley's thesis was more accurate than not, even for the rather stodgy Yale of the late 1940's.

Nevertheless, the question is whether this liberalization of values was a permanent development among Yale (and other university) products, or whether it was transformed by later life experiences. Some work has been done on "adult socialization," and there is certainly an ample literature on the methods of carrying out this type of research. But in general the easiest way would be the best way. This would be to buy some space on the Roper or Harris regular national poll and to have them pose several questions regarding experiences with university athletics, in particular attendance at sport spectaculars. Once these questions were posed, it would be easy to cross-tabulate these responses against the attitudinal questions that are already regularly asked on the national polls. Through this process we could determine roughly the extent to which attendance at amateur sport spectaculars has a bearing upon later outlook. We would naturally want to control for those who went to college. But we would also want to look for the so-called "subway alumni" -- those who had a favorite college team despite no record of attendance. Notre Dame perhaps has the largest following of that sort, but every state university has a very large subway alumni. Through this very simple research approach, it would be possible not only to tease out certain of the influences of college sport on college students but also to assess roughly whether the influences (benefits) emanate beyond that point.

4. Another area that has important bearing upon this whole issue is the activity that is ancillary and complementary to athletics but

not part of athletics itself. I have reference of course to marching bands, parades, anthems, etc. Here again the method of research would be content analysis, and the materials would be quite easy to acquire.

One brief story might help point to the major relationship and the type of research that might be worthwhile. In 1949, Michigan State was admitted to the Big Ten, and 1950 would be the first year in which its teams could compete on a full schedule for Big Ten championships. During the football season of autumn 1949, the Michigan State marching band was still a traditional band with olive drab uniforms, a slow military cadence, and an orientation toward marching and toward good concert music. For example, oboes, flutes and bassoons were still used in marching formation. However, within two years, as the football team grew in stature, the marching band grew in size, gave a variety of scholarships to encourage good musicians to join and take part in tremendously long rehearsals each week, changed its uniforms to bright green and white with plumes and gloves and the like, and nearly doubled its cadence. In fact, the speed was now so fast that it was impossible to play anything but the simplest of marches. John Philip Sousa went out the window with the military uniforms and the military cadence. Marching was minimized and formations were maximized. The whole thing became extremely active and intense, paralleling the rise in emphasis and success of the athletic teams themselves.

Analysis of the ancillary activities would of course focus in on such things as the subject-matter and appeals of the anthems, the cheers, and the particular symbols. But of course the influence of this aspect of amateur sport goes far beyond the performances of the day of the play. What is not generally recognized is the role that amateur sport has played in the expansion of public school music! A tremendous number of students who major in music at the big state universities were first inspired by band participation in sporting events, and are in college in order to prepare themselves to become band directors. Through this route, amateur sport has spread its influence tremendously, not only through the larger number of people it reaches, but through that very substantial and institutionalized influence of the next generation of teachers of music and arts. One of the most important pieces of research, therefore, would be on the public school music programs of the colleges and upon the products of these public school music programs who are out teaching youngsters to play band instruments and rehearsing the bands to perform at the halftime shows and at the pep rallies. All of these people look to their home college for guidance and influence. And all of them play the martial music and repeat the symbols that build a certain type of rapport into students at very young ages. This is a tremendously important and self-reinforcing process, yet we know precious little about it.

5. Getting more directly to the everyday business of social integration and civic training inside the university, it would be

desirable also to pick a panel of university students and to follow them for interviews and re-interviews throughout one or more academic years. Panel research is often used in studies of the development of attitudes and of socialization. Once the particular nature of this inquiry were fully designed, it would be relatively easy for students of political socialization to carry out a study of this sort. I personally would like to go farther than usual and employ the polygraph for this kind of research, in order to get at the non-cognitive responses to sports and anthems rather than simply the expressed attitudes. The polygraph is popularly known as the lie-detector, but it may have far better uses for the study of emotional response in general than it does to the business of producing evidence for legal cases. Since the whole purpose of spectator sport and ancillary activities is to intensify experience, there is every reason to expect that for the most highly identified persons, there will be measurable changes in physical state. It would be marvelous fun to collaborate with physiologists and doctors on a serious piece of political research.

6. Facing up to the difficulties of such an unconventional approach to the study of emotional rapport and the appeals of patriotism and social identification, unobtrusive approaches have to be contrived to get at part of the same thing. The first four pieces of proposed research would enable a clever analyst to make interpretations in the general area of emotional rapport, but the more direct we could get the better off we would be. Thus, in addition to the use of the Roper-type polling methods -- that is, the usual approach to socialization --

we could definitely add a useful piece of research on cycles of anti-social behavior during the school year. The hypothesis would be that indicators of anti-social behavior, of actual physical illness, and of malingering vary with the athletic season. College clinic admission rolls would make an excellent source of data. The record of arrests made by the local police and by the campus authorities would make another. Wanton acts of vandalism are another. Going back a few years, it is possible to trace out the relationships between empty periods of athletics and such random activities as panty raids. Perhaps in more recent years there is some kind of relationship between athletic season cycles and student political activity. For, even though the leadership of most student radical politics has been from the most intellectualized of students who care little about amateur or professional sport, their opportunities for a following are very much determined by all the other events that compete for attention and loyalty.

These six proposals flow directly from the framework designed in this paper. But there are other research possibilities that can also be derived therefrom, and a full-scale research conference ought to be held to generate the best and most efficient approach to these phenomena. The main purpose here was simply to try to provide a perspective for thinking about this area and then to suggest a limited few project ideas that would set better minds at work.

## Caveats Before Conclusions

Since we are in the midst of a critical revision of the whole athletic idea, there will be a tendency to enter into research and assessment in a negative frame of mind. Since college sport has grown too large and too expensive and too diverting, and since it has long since verged on the brink of professionalism, our effort to rethink the area is likely to commit us to reforms before assessments. The problem with that is that we might also be influenced in the character of the question we ask and in the way we look at some of the results. This would be unfortunate. This phenomenon is a bona fide part of the history of education and of civic loyalty in the United States, and should be given a fair appraisal.

For this reason, it is of vital importance that a double-level history be undertaken first (item 1 above). This will provide an absolutely indispensable context within which to make a dispassionate assessment. We must be sure before we try to replace spectator sport, and we must also study a function carefully in order to replace it, in the words spoken wisely by Robert Ruark, with "something of value." This kind of history would clearly give us a basis for making a ve[illegible] sober approach to the design of questions and analysis of other data.

Perhaps the most important reason for moving carefully and respectfully in our assessment of amateur sport in colleges is because the available alternatives as a means of integration and civic training are either flimsy or very costly. This is precisely the reason I spent so much time outlining the history of universities and university norms. Further history along these lines will put us in a position to decide whether technocratization of the university is an acceptable answer. Many faculty members and others are altogether ready to de-emphasize spectator sport when that issue is put in a single yea-nay form to them. But when this phenomenon is laid down beside an alternative like technocratization, their opinions are not likely to be the same. It could very well turn out that such are the functions of spectator sport in the great American universities, and such are the freedoms that it leaves for the non-participant, that the price is well worth paying. We simply do not know, because we have not made the proper research. If we are to make a rational decision about the future, we must first identify all the alternatives, assess all of their relative costs, and all of their relative consequences. Only then can we take a reasonable position.

And only then can we reach out toward the larger, the still larger, issue of the needs of the state for loyalty and support. No one would deny that all modern nation-states must cultivate some basic loyalties. Questions arise only over how much and by what means shall the state be allowed to cultivate these feelings of patriotism. These are extremely abstract and complex matters to deal with. One of the best ways to deal with them is to look at those institutions, such as higher education, upon which the state is most likely to rely. Thus, as we manage to carry out some concrete research as proposed in this paper, we will also be in a better position to reach out toward the larger assessment that may, taken by itself, be beyond the reach of direct research.

APPENDIX H

# WOMEN IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

March 6, 1974

Mary McKeown

# WOMEN IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

When intercollegiate athletics came into its own in the last three decades of the nineteenth century, "women for whom attendance at sporting events had been forbidden by the dictates of decency, made intercollegiates an aspect of their independence." (Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University, A History, p. 392). History repeats itself, for in the early part of the last three decades of the twentieth century, women are again making intercollegiate athletics an aspect of their emancipation.

For the past one hundred years, intercollegiate athletics has been a bastion of male supremacy, an area in which men were unchallenged and even revered by women. During that century intercollegiate athletics for men developed complex governing organization, like the National Collegiate Athletic Association, with complex rules to control the many facets of complex (and all male) athletic plants. Women were excluded from that development because it was rumored that they were uninterested and physically unfit for the strenuous athletic competition. But, as society has changed in the past one hundred years, so too have attitudes of women toward athletics. No longer is the "weaker sex" uninterested in sports participation. Indeed, women are now demanding equal access to such participation and equal voice in control of that participation, just as women in 1890 demanded an opportunity to share the spectator benefits of intercollegiate athletics. But this time, the force of federal law is providing the needed impetus to insure that women's emancipation becomes a reality instead of a dream.

To achieve this equality, women have to overcome the inertia and discrimination of one hundred years, discrimination to which they have themselves contributed. It was a woman who wrote that "muscular capacity in women is almost evidence of disease" (Arabella Kenneally, 1899) and another woman who wrote that "girls are not suited for the same athletic program as boys" (Ethel Rerrin, National Amateur Athletic Federation, 1928). It was the delegates to the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women delegate assembly in 1973 who indicated that a total budget of about $25,000 would be sufficient to run a good women's intercollegiate athletic program, even though the men find it necessary to spend over a million dollars to insure a good men's program. Such attitudes are a product of the history of intercollegiate athletics for women.

When men at one college started to challenge men at other colleges in sports competition, society would not have approved if women at one college had challenged women at another. Indeed, there simply were not many women in colleges and universities during the early era of intercollegiate athletics. Such women as did attend college in the 1800's did so to learn a specific profession - nursing, home economics, teaching, the "practical" arts. This was in marked contrast to the purposes of a college education for men who "studied" as "gentlemen scholars." These "gentlemen" had reserves of unused energy, which were put to better use in sports programs than in the student riots on which an earlier generation of college students had expended their energies. Women students did not have this extra energy, or extra time. Thus, it would not seem unusual that sports for men became important, while sports for women did not.

Contributing to this separation were the social mores of that day. It was improper for a young lady to engage in the strenuous activities of athletics, or to show their limbs to men other than their husbands. A thick web of myth about and tabus against the participation of women in intercollegiate athletics was spun. Examples of this myth can be found all over: "In women, inferiority of the locomotive apparatus is apparent in all parts." (Dr. Chandler Gilman, 1840).

"Under prolonged and intense physical strain, a girl goes to pieces nervously." (Ethel Perrin, 1928).

"The women's division does not approve of boys' rules for girls because of the undesirable social qualities girls develop when they attempt to be poor imitators of the other sex." (Irma Neveres, 1941).

However, despite this myth and tabu, women did participate in sports because the educational values of an athletic program overcame the myths. It is publicly accepted that sports are good for people in developing better citizens, building vigorous minds and bodies, and promoting a better society. However, in the words of Sports Illustrated "Sports may be good for people, but they are considered a lot gooder for male people than for female people." (Sports

Illustrated, May 28, 1973). Although this may be true, it is somewhat of a paradox that this is the one issue which most differentiates men and women's intercollegiate athletics today. Women participate in intercollegiate athletics for the educational values therein. Men's programs have long since lost this reason for existence, except when the propriety of the placement of intercollegiate athletics in collegiate institutions is questioned.

Before the current role of women in intercollegiate athletics can be discussed, and understood, the history of the woman's role should be reviewed to gain perspective and insight.

College and universities, and their athletic programs, have been said to be a mirror of societal attitudes and concerns. This mirror, however, is a delayed-action mirror; an instant replay, so to speak. What occurs in, is an issue in, or are the values of the macrosociety in turn becomes an issue, or is valued in the microsociety of higher education, but several years after the event has occurred in society at large.

Thus, when athletics first burst upon the college scene, it was not surprising that it was a man's world. Women did not participate in, or spectate at, sporting events because societal mores did not permit such participation or observation for young ladies of proper upbringing. A good young lady would not sully her reputation by appearing at events of such questionable value and of such a rowdy nature as sports events. When women in the society outside the college campus began to demand "emancipation," so did women on college campuses. Their entrance to the sports scene came through the gate of spectating at football games. Indeed, such numbers of women, both students and public, attended games that such attendance became the "in" thing to do socially.

Women's participation on college campuses in sports began at all-woman schools. There was such a vocal public outcry against this unladylike posture that the college women had to withdraw to secluded playing fields. This withdrawal, however, did not dampen any enthusiasm the women had for competition. Girls continued to compete against other girls although public attitudes did not condone such competition. Women athletes were viewed as somewhat less than real women even then, although men athletes were revered as "real" men.

Why didn't the participation of women in athletics on college campuses appear to mirror what was going on in society? It actually did. On college campuses, as well as in society, strong women, persistent women, like Babe Diedreksen Zaharias, continued to be involved in and excel at athletics. But these women seldom gained the acclaim given men. The subtle discrimination against women in society existed, multiplied in its image, on the college campuses. Women did not charge admission to spectate at their sporting events - that would be "selling their bodies." Men participated in games - women had "playdays." Men were given scholarships and ever-increasing budgets in support of intercollegiate athletic programs - women sold candy and had bake sales.

As society has changed its attitudes toward discrimination against women in the last twenty years, with the force of law - The Civil Rights Amendment, Executive Order 11246 and the Equal Pay Act of 1963 - so has intercollegiate athletics changed with the force of law - the Educational Amendments Act of 1972, PL 92-318. Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act explicitly states that no person shall be excluded from, be denied the benefits, or be precluded from participation in any educational activity carried out by an institution which received funds from the federal government, on the basis of sex. Contrary to what the Wall Street Journal stated in its editorial on Title IX on February 26, 1974, this law applies to all educational institutions which receive money from the federal government, regardless of the use that is made of that money.

Guidelines are being drafted by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for this bill. Those guidelines, according to the most recent statement from HEW, will be released the early part of May. Such delay in the publications of guidelines is unprecedented. HEW explains by saying that this is such a touchy issue that they feel it is important that the guidelines be all-encompassing. In reality, it appears that HEW is more concerned about stepping on the toes of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, which is lobbying in great strength against the previously discussed guidelines.

Fairly reliable reports of those guidelines mention the following points as being covered by the guidelines:

Different standards for men and women for the offering of scholarships and other financial aid is specifically forbidden.

The setting of standards of behavior for athletes must be agreed upon by the men's and women's regulatory groups.

Comparable toilet, locker and shower facilities must be provided for the different sexes, but these facilities may be separate.

If a college or university offers a sport which participation in is dominated by members of one sex, then a comparable team must be offered that season for members of the opposite sex.

This would seem to indicate that intercollegiate athletic programs as they are known today would cease to exist. Perhaps a much better animal will evolve in the place of the current dinosaur.

It should be emphasized that, although the guidelines are still being drafted, Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 is now, and has been since June, 1972, law. Court cases under this law have been filed in several courts. It could be expected that many more will be filed, for, if the preliminary research done in this study is any indication, then essentially all colleges and universities in the United States which are coeducational schools, are in violation of federal law and could lose all their federal funding.

What is the current situation in intercollegiate athletics for women, beside the fact that most programs are in violation of federal law?

At the national level, there is a regulatory body, the Association of Intercollegiate Athletics for Women, a spin-off of the Division of Girls and Womens Sports of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation (AAHPER), an affiliate of the National Education Association (NEA). AIAW began in 1971, and, under the spectre of Title IX has attempted, in the brief period since its founding, to catch up with the National Collegiate Athletic Association and its myriad rules and regulations. The AIAW operates under severe financial limitations - its budget is under $50,000, less than the salary of the executive director of the NCAA alone. AIAW employs only one full-time staff person and one assistant. Admittedly, not much staff can be purchased for under $50,000, especially when, out of that money, must come office expenses and court costs.

The structure of AIAW is similar to that of the NCAA, before the NCAA "separated" into three divisions. There are nine regions within the AIAW, the most developed of which is Division One, the east coast group. Under the auspices of the East Coast Athletic Conference, a governing agency developed primarily for regulation of men's athletics, Division One has the most complete schedules and and championship competition. There are two levels of championship competition within AIAW: junior college and all other schools. AIAW sponsors championships in sports: volleyball, golf, tennis, swimming, track and field, basketball, baseball, and recognizes at least seven other sports in intercollegiate competition: gymnastics, badminton, lacrosse, field hockey, fencing, football, and soccer. There is no distinction made between revenue and non-revenue producing sports, nor any distinction between contact and non-contact sports.

Until the latter part of 1973, women who accepted athletic scholarships were precluded from participation in AIAW-sponsored championships. Due to a lawsuit filed by two girls in Florida who were prohibited from participating in the AIAW tennis championships because they held athletic scholarships, the AIAW has re-structured its position on scholarships. Many state organizations have not, however, and still prohibit the offering of athletic scholarships to women, and the collection of admissions at any women's intercollegiate sporting event.

Under AIAW regulations, women may now accept financial aid based on their athletic ability. However, the regulations for accepting or offering such financial aid have not yet been distributed to member schools by the AIAW. AIAW is dragging its heels in this area partly because there is a fear of lawsuits arising from the difference between women's and men's regulations and partly because most AIAW members oppose athletic financial aid for athletes, men and women athletes alike.

Opposition to this financial aid seems to be based on the premise that, because so many excesses in the administration of aid programs for men have occurred, that aid to women would also breed excesses. The women argue that they want to protect the female athlete from exploitation. Why women need more protection than men is unclear. In loco parentis is dead on most college campuses. Also unclear is why women's financial aid would go the way that the men's has gone. It would seem that, since men's and women's programs, under federal law, must be equal, that this would be an excellent opportunity for the women in intercollegiate athletics to lead the men out of the quagmire in which they have become bogged. This would be an excellent opportunity for all the coaches and athletic directors who have been screaming that they would like to eliminate all the excesses to which financial aid has gone to put their money where their mouths are.

Women athletes do not see the issue here in the same light as their coaches. These girls are asking why, when male athletes have had their college educations paid for, should women not receive the same benefits. They see financial aid to athletes as the means by which many a young man has received a college education when he could not otherwise afford one. They question why they have been denied the advantage of intercollegiate athletics. It is the woman athlete who will be forcing attention on the issue of financial aid for athletes, with the help of the Educational Amendments Act, for the women coaches and administrators refuse to act without threat of expensive lawsuits.

The financial aid question - to give or not to give - seems to be one of the issues with which the majority of women in intercollegiate athletics can identify, and should be studied by a national commission.

Closely related to the financial aid issue is the question of equitable financing for women's programs. It is no big secret requiring intense research to ferret out the facts that women's programs receive little, if any, money while men's programs receive millions of dollars. One specific example should suffice: at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign the women's intercollegiate athletic budget is $14,000 this year, up from $4,500 last year, while the men's intercollegiate athletic budget is in excess of 2.3 million dollars. In a research article in the October, 1973 issue of the Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, concerning the status of funding of women's intercollegiate athletics, it was reported that the mean amount expended at 209 schools which are members of the AIAW for women's programs was $8,900. The mean total amount budgeted at those same 209 schools for men's programs was over $450,000. The same article reported the responses of the directors of women's intercollegiate programs to the question of what would be an adequate level of financing for support of a good, complete women's intercollegiate program. The mean amount which those people responded was $22,000. That is hardly enough to pay the salary of one good coach! It may be that these people have been on nickel and dime budgets for so long that $22,000 seems like a huge amount to them.

An earlier section of this total report has delineated the plight of many men's athletic programs which are now operating in the red. Enter the women into this scene, women who are demanding that they receive an amount equal to the men. And the women have the force of federal law behind them. This is a scene that terrifies many directors of intercollegiate athletics, and has prompted some illogical responses from Walter Byers, Executive Director of the National Collegiate Athletic Association. Mr. Byers has stated that this equality of funding will lead to the destruction of intercollegiate athletics. What Mr. Byers means is that it will probably lead to a change in the intercollegiate athletic world, and in NCAA.

Where will the money for women's programs come? From new sources? Not only is that unlikely, as there is only so much money in the pie to be divided among the athletic groups, but it also is likely that it would be against the intent of the federal law to fund women's programs differently than men's - i.e.,from different sources. Does this mean that men's programs will be cut back to some reasonable level?

Men argue that the fact that the athletic departments are in financial trouble means that all sports except the revenue-producing sports should be eliminated. This would effectively eliminate women's sports before that area has had a chance to develop. There are two major points here: because some sports are revenue-producing does not mean that a program comprised of those alone would be legal; and no one has given the women's program a fair opportunity to determine which of the women's sports, if any, would be revenue-producing.

Before the financial problems of men's intercollegiate athletics can be solved, the women's must be attended to. This is an area where solution of the problem must be reached by men's and women's athletic programs working together. Therefore, this issue is one which deserves in-depth research by the national commission.

Inequitable financing leads to inequitable facilities and equipment. It has long been a fact of athletic life for women that they have been considered second class citizens when facilities and equipment were assigned. (One woman has stated that she would be happy to be a second class citizen. It was being relegated to fifth class status that bothers her!) This situation has arisen out of the history of intercollegiate athletics. The men were there first, and naturally got the best, giving what was left to the women. These women had to fight to be permitted to use the playing fields and tennis courts at times other than from 2:00-4:00 A.M. After all, women should not be seen on the playing fields, or so it was thought around the turn of the century. On some campuses varsity teams, junior varsity teams, freshmen teams, men's intramurals and club sports receive priority over the women's varsity teams in the use of courts and fields.

While the football teams spend $15,000 repairing and replacing uniforms, the entire women's program passed around fifteen uniforms from one team to another over the school year. If new uniforms were desired, the girls sold cookies to make money, bought the uniforms out of their own pockets, or received money out of the pocket of the coach, who was underpaid already, and who also paid for travel expenses and other "minor" things out of her own pocket.

This issue of inadequate pay and non-economic rewards for women coaches is closely related to the issue of equitable financing for women's programs. Without adequate financing, it is inevitable that salaries will be inadequate and inevitable that competent people are constrained from entering the coaching "profession." Indeed, many women who could be competent coaches were, and still are, precluded from coaching on an equal level with men because they are unable at many universities to take for credit the coaching courses. Then, when women apply for coaching positions, they are eliminated from consideration because they do not have the credentials; coaching courses. Since it is through the avenue of coaching that administrators for athletic programs rise, women are axed out of administrative positions, too. Further, coaches for women's teams did the coaching without release time, i.e., as an extracurricular activity. Most women coaches are connected with the physical education department, which is not the case of the men. Although this is slowly changing, the issue of release time for coaching or for administering a women's intercollegiate program is still a big one. Therefore, the question of equality for coaches should also be studied by the national commission.

A bigger issue identified by the woman coach was the determination of what is equality on athletic teams. Should women play on men's teams? Should men play on women's teams? If this is so, it is feared that this would mean, effectively, the elimination of women's programs. Should there be coed teams, or would this merely mean men's teams with an outstanding woman or two?

AIAW members favor separate-but-equal as the standard for team membership. This, they believe, would avoid the elimination of the women's program and provide equality. However, it may be against the law. Separate-but-equal has been stricken down by the Supreme Court in civil rights litigation. It would be reasonable to expect the same decision under the Educational Amendments Act provisions. Therefore, other alternatives, like an assignment of different teams by weight or height should be researched.

The majority of issues which have been identified up to this point are issues which concern the women's athletic establishment, if there is such a thing. Women athletes themselves appear concerned with two issues: financial aid and the mystique of the woman athlete.

While male athletic stars are relegated to demi-god status on college campuses, and in the press, women athletes are regarded with contempt and ridicule. Their femininity is questioned; many women athletes are suspected of homosexuality (gotta watch out for those girl jocks!) and have their sexual identities questioned. It takes a strong girl to bear up under the attacks that are mounted against her participation in athletics, from the time she is in kindergarten (a tomboy) until she graduates from college. If a girl opts to play on the lunch hour baseball team, she is stuck so far out in left field that she cannot be found. Her turn to bat seldom comes up during the lunch hour. And if, by chance, it does, she better be able to hit the ball farther than any boy there, or be subjected to scorn and ridicule. Is it any wonder, then, that not many girls go out for intercollegiate athletics, after growing up in an environment like this supportive one? This should illustrate that the figures which seem to support the point that not many girls are interested in intercollegiate athletics are misleading. Not many men would be interested in athletic programs if they were the subject of scorn and ridicule for their interest in them, or if the programs did not have adequate moral and financial support.

If a girl does succeed in athletics, she will seldom see her accomplishments mentioned in the press, locally or otherwise. When a man breaks an intercollegiate track record by a tenth of a second, his name can be seen in sports page headlines. When a woman swimmer cut thirty (Yes, thirty) seconds from the 880 meter intercollegiate freestyle swimming record recently, her accomplishment was mentioned in an article on the fifth page of the sports section. This only serves to illustrate the relative emphasis that society places on men's and women's intercollegiate programs. This does not necessarily mean that women should receive more attention; it may imply that men should receive less. Society may do young men a disfavor by extolling their athletic accomplishments to the point of making these young men superheroes. It is difficult to come down to earth when the next superhero takes over one's place in the heavens. Women, so far, have been spared this kind of rude awakening. It may be time to spare the men also.

It has been mentioned before that higher education is a delayed-action mirror of societal concerns. One important issue to the women in the macrosociety may have more impact upon the removal of discriminatory practices, and discrimination against women, in intercollegiate athletics than all the other concerns of the women's athletic establishment. This will be so for no other reason than that the establishment, i.e., the members of AIAW, refuses to act.

Today's "women libbers" who are providing the impetus for the equal rights movement are also mothers. These women, who may not react to discrimination against themselves in athletics, react, non-violently of course, but vocally, against discrimination in athletic opportunities for their daughters and sons. As one ex-athlete said at an Illinois state legislative hearing on women's intercollegiate athletics, "I have been discriminated aginst in athletics. OK - I am old enough now that that no longer concerns me. But don't anyone try to discriminate against my daughters. They deserve the same chance my sons have."

Since the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world, it is said, then the handwriting may be on the wall for intercollegiate athletics. These women are demanding that their children get what they never got themselves. That demand, with the power of the law, and the pressure which can be placed on intercollegiate athletics by this market of spectators, may be the deciding factor in the formulation of policy regarding intercollegiate athletics.

This report has delineated several major and several minor issues related to the woman's role in intercollegiate athletics which should be studied by a national commission: financing, coaching, financial aid for athletes, determination of team membership, administration of athletic programs, societal expectations and the educational value of intercollegiate athletics.

It is important that these issues not be studied in the isolation of women's programs. In fact, these issues are of such import that it would be impossible to arrive at any solution to the problems facing women in intercollegiate athletics without considering how these issues fit into the total picture of men's and women's intercollegiate athletics. It is hoped that a national commission will study issues and recommend solutions which are for the good of intercollegiate athletics, and higher education, and society, rather than those which are for the good of women, or men, alone. Women may have come a long way, baby, to get where they are today in intercollegiate athletics; but they cannot go any further without concerted effort by men and women to make progress which benefits all intercollegiate athletics.

APPENDIX I

# THE EXPERIENCE OF SENIOR COLLEGES THAT HAVE DISCONTINUED FOOTBALL

March 7, 1974 Felix Springer

# The Experience of Senior Colleges That Have Discontinued Football

## I

The general question that this appendix addresses itself to is--what has been the experience of those senior colleges and universities which have discontinued a varsity intercollegiate football program? This question was divided into two related parts--what were the reasons for discontinuing football[1] and what were the effects of the discontinuation? Approximately one-fifth of the 151 senior colleges that the National Collegiate Athletic Association lists (See Attachment One for this list) as having given up football since 1939 were questioned.

The people consulted at these institutions were primarily athletic directors and administration officials in charge of the athletic department (e.g.,the vice-president in charge of student affairs or in some cases the president of the college himself) but included admissions directors, financial aid directors, students, and faculty. The inquiries aimed not at achieving data oriented results but rather at ascertaining common denominators in the experience of discontinuation. I sought to identify the important questions related to discontinuation and to render what appeared to be the prevalent answers to those questions with an eye cast toward the relevancy of those answers to

---

1. To avoid the constant repetition of a long phrase and to forestall confusion throughout the rest of this appendix, whenever the word football is used without modification, varsity intercollegiate football is to be understood.

the nationwide problems besetting intercollegiate athletics today. Thus, although the early 1950's is the heaviest era of discontinuation, most schools that gave up football are located in the south and mid-atlantic states, and a vast majority of all the schools have enrollments of under 2,000 students and low-profile programs, I concentrated on the larger schools and on those that most recently had abandoned big-time or relatively big-time football.[2] I also tried to make sure that all sections of the country were as equally consulted as possible.

The original rationale for the general question underlying this appendix exists in two particular observations and the questions that arose from them. Since football, because of the publicity it receives and because events like homecoming revolve around it, is acknowledged as one of the primary magnets that attracts alumni interest and support, what happens to alumni giving and general fund raising when it is discontinued seemed like an obvious and vital question to ask. Also, since football has traditionally been, and has been seen as, both the kingpin and underpinning of intercollegiate athletic programs, it seemed important to find out what happens to the rest of the athletic program (both intercollegiate and intramural) when football is discontinued.

These two particular questions generated so much response and

---

2. By relatively big-time I mean competing among the 145 schools the NCAA now classifies as Division II football schools, e.g., The Yankee Conference schools, Delaware, Eastern Michigan, Grambling, Hawaii, Lehigh, etc.

raised so many other related questions that they became the major sections of the appendix under the rubrics of (1) financial effects and (2) effects on athletic program. The other section to deal with effects goes under the title of educational environment. Such topics as the effects on admissions, ethical and academic standards, and school morale are discussed there.

The second section of this appendix reveals the major circumstances that led to discontinuation. It is important to keep in mind these factors when the effects are discussed, because the fact that there were few negative effects seems mostly due to the circumstances under which football departed. Almost invariably the net cost of football was in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, the team was losing more often than not on the gridiron, and football attracted little student, alumni, or community support. In short, it was not a healthy organism at these institutions and its death naturally caused little lamentation.

Attachment One is the list of presently existing senior colleges that have discontinued football since 1939. Attachment Two consists of a brief description and analysis of the kinds of schools on the list. A few points about the list, however, seem important to make at the outset of this report rather than at its end.

The 151 senior colleges which have discontinued football include a strikingly large number of independent big-time basketball powers as well as a strikingly small total (ten) of publicly supported institutions. One of the questions that arose from these observations--Does the discontinuation of football have any effect on the basketball program and, if so, why?--is taken up in the section on effects on athletic programs.

There are undoubtedly many reasons that account for the small number of public institutions on the list (five of the ten have resumed football in fact). Among those offered were the fact that state legislators are freer with taxpayer money than private donors are with theirs and the fact that there are few state schools with huge financial deficits in football. The reason encountered most often in the course of this inquiry, however, was that the tuition part of athletic scholarships is waived by almost every state--New York and Alaska were the only exceptions turned up in one survey. Thus, since football is usually discontinued because it costs too much money, a tuition waiver prevents discontinuation in part because it makes the cost at publicly supported colleges look considerably less than it does at private ones.

Of the 151 institutions that discontinued football, 29 resumed it on a varsity level at a future date. Of those 29, six discontinued it again. Resumption appears never to involve escalation and almost invariably entails de-emphasis. The experience surrounding resumption is discussed under effects on athletic programs.

One last introductory point is that it is difficult to assess or predict trends from the list of colleges that have discontinued football. One point which can be made, however, is that there has been a small but steady decline in the number of schools playing big-time and relatively big-time football, particularly among private colleges. The fact that the NCAA in their Newsletter of January 1, 1974, reveals that the number of varsity football-playing four-year colleges has increased by fifteen in the last five years does not contradict the previous assertion. The additions are low-profile Division III programs at schools that previously had club football. Whereas the number of intercollegiate varsity football programs appears to be growing at the grass roots, low-profile level, the number of big-time and relatively big-time programs seems to be steadily declining.

## II

The circumstance almost all colleges which abandoned football shared was that their administration felt the net cost of football to be prohibitive. Many schools were in the midst of financial crises and were reevaluating all their programs and needs. At others, not in the throes of an immediate monetary squeeze, the net cost of football was thought to represent a severe financial problem by itself--one whose consequences would be felt more particularly in the future.

Football was usually parted with reluctantly with the word "priorities" surfacing more often than not when administrators explained its abandonment. At the schools that discontinued football it was invariably looked on as just another service that the school provided for its students. Most officers felt that football was a worthwhile service and program, but was costing too much without providing enough for the needs of enough students. One not unrepresentative comment was, "Dollar for dollar we should be getting more for our money." The "more" did not mean more academic programs, instructors, or facilities. The more almost always meant increased participation in and at athletic endeavors. This was one of the many avenues most colleges took to make it clear that the discontinuation of football was in no way a statement of the college's feeling about athletic competition or athletics.

At schools with big-time and relatively big-time programs the net cost of football (including the tuition part of scholarships and grants-in-aid as well as the room, board and fees part and including salaries of coaches) was put at 250 to 500 thousand dollars a year. The lower range of these figures usually came from schools that gave up football in the 1950's and early 1960's. Even the net cost of low-profile programs was most often said to be around 100 thousand dollars a year.

At most, but not all, schools two factors went hand in hand with huge financial deficits--lack of interest and support from alumni, the public, and most especially from students (particularly in terms of attendance) and a consistent recent record of losing on the field. Although a multitude of factors was often cited by those consulted as they explained the financial picture that led to discontinuing football at their institution, these two--lack of student interest and a losing record--were seen most often as essential parts of the scenario.

A number of officials said that if there had been significant student support for football, if they felt that football was fulfilling substantial needs and desires beyond those of the coaches and players themselves, then it would have been continued even if that support didn't reduce the cost substantially. The suspicion in most minds was, of course, that the cost would have been reduced if students en masse gave their support. At some institutions, in fact, the relationship between discontinuation and student support was clear as students were given the option of saving a football program by voting more student activities fees to it. Thus, as the case stood, without student, alumni, or community support, these officials said in echo of one another that football made no sense at their institutions because of its cost.

Moreover, a number of people pointed out that the other (non-financial) returns football, with continually losing records, provided also were negative ones. Only adverse publicity and responses seemed to accrue. The criticism the football team's performance received at some schools was extended often to the institution's general ability to manage its affairs. The football team was equated with the university and the team's performance was taken to be a significant measure of how poorly the university as a whole was doing. This kind of feedback naturally only intensified any thoughts toward the cessation of football.

The three interrelated conditions I have described--huge financial deficits, lack of student support, and a consistent recent record of far below .500 years on the gridiron--represent by far the most common set of circumstances leading to the end of football. Before I go on to describe other sets of circumstances that occurred less frequently, I should note that almost all the big-time programs that were discontinued contained the three conditions described above.

One more important condition was cited by big-time abandoners as crucial to their deteriorating financial picture and hold on student, alumni, and community interest--their location. Almost invariably they said that they were in a situation that had become impossible to prosper in. These former big-time football programs were either in a large urban environment where competition for the sports entertainment dollar had become fierce or in a locale where other big-time programs are plentiful and are much more successful.

It was the cost of football plus the fact of these locations that primarily prevented any lingering thoughts about salvaging the program by upgrading it. The additional money it would have taken to make their discontinued big-time football program potentially competitive at the level of the average Division I college was put at between one and two million dollars a year. Officials emphasized that even this additional investment could not insure success on the field or in the box-office. The college had to be willing to face the probability of commiting around one and a half million dollars for a number of years with little hope that even a winning big-time team, with eventually widespread student, community, and alumni support, would approach a self-sustaining status. Thus visions of upgrading dissipated quickly.

The second scenario involved a financial deficit as well and often one as substantial as those mentioned earlier. But here the football team was reasonably competitive (typically hovering at or slightly below the .500 mark) and there was felt to be considerable, although never overwhelming, student interest and support. Even here, however, the net cost of football was thought to be prohibitive for the number of needs fulfilled.

Moreover at some of these institutions the conference they were in or the schools they had scheduled were committed to upgrading their programs by, for instance, allocating more scholarships. Thus the future held that keeping up with the competition meant that even more money had to be spent.

Officials at these schools felt that football had just priced itself out of existence in terms of what else the same money could provide. The dissatisfactions with football were not as great as at the schools in the first group discussed in this section. The expectations for it and psychological investment in it also didn't seem as great because these schools were willing and able to give it up before it declined to the non-competitive, unsupported status it had at the first group.

Most of the schools in this second group were small schools with relatively low-profile programs--at best the programs were at the caliber of the average football school on the NCAA Division III list. It is my feeling that concentration on big-time football in this survey made it seem that the first set of circumstances is the most common. If a more representative survey of the schools that have discontinued football had been taken, i.e., including the correct proportion of low-profile programs, I believe that this second set of circumstances--financial deficits, comparatively as great as those suffered at bigger schools sponsoring big-time programs, along with a mediocre but not terrible football program--would have turned up at least as frequently as the first set. Thus above all it seems that it was the exorbitant cost of fielding a football team that caused its cessation at every level.

At a few of the smaller colleges questioned, the sole reason for abandoning football was the lack of bodies. A severe early campaign had decimated the ranks and it had become impossible to play without dangerously overburdening the physical abilities of the remaining squad members. At these schools usually a commitment was made to recruit and enroll more football players and the schools resumed play in the near future.

Finally at one school the reason for a one year discontinuation was that the president of the university was appalled at the football coach's illegal subsidy of his team members. This coach was in the process of upgrading what had been a low-profile program at a school with all low-profile programs. Football, although not the coach, was brought back after a year's hiatus under changed conditions. The program was de-emphasized--no longer were scholarships given, for instance--and a new league of like-minded institutions was set up. About twenty years later that league still seems to be operating swimmingly.

III

Once football was discontinued, the institutions took one of two views on the money that had been expended on it. Either the net cost of football was looked on as an eliminated debt or it was looked on as money given to athletics. But when given specifically to football the money was considered ill-used.

Most often the universities took the latter view although only in part. That is, part of the net cost of football was seen as eliminated debt and part of it as money that should go into the athletic program but had been going in too great an amount to provide enjoyment and services for too few.

Thus the demise of football was often the catalyst for across the board improvements in the rest of the athletic program--both intramural and intercollegiate. For instance, a number of university administrators said that money that had gone into football was looked upon as the money that went into the building of major athletic facilities like gymnasiums, swimming pools, and tennis courts. At one university after discontinuation a part of the yearly net cost--$250,000--went each year into a building fund for a new all-purpose fieldhouse that would provide vitally needed facilities for a burgeoning intramural program as well as for a more emphasized varsity intercollegiate basketball program. Other financial windfalls to athletics are discussed in the section on effects on athletic programs.

All schools were greatly concerned about the effect the cessation of football would have on alumni giving. The experience of almost all schools was that it had no significant negative effect and in some instances had considerable positive results. The schools invariably were careful about explaining to alumni the financial exigencies that caused them to give up football, and the vast majority of the alumni were understanding. They responded to the real present-day dire circumstances. Some, however, held out for a nostalgic past, a hopeful future, or an impossible dream represented by Notre Dame.

At a few schools a vocal minority expressed outrage and vowed to cut off funds from the university. At these schools the feeling was that the amount of money these alumni had been contributing was negligible and that it had all gone to the football program anyway.

At one school a huge critical outcry was raised by the alumni and promises of abundant financial support were forthcoming. The promised vein of gold turned out to be a mere capillary, however, as the money raised was about one-twenty-fifth of the yearly net cost of football at that school. At some schools a few alumni tried to get together to save football, but these efforts were short-lived and futile in so far as their avowed purpose of attracting widespread support for continuing or bringing back football went.

The sentiment at almost all schools was that most alumni, like most students, were excited by and would give support to only an existing successful big-time program--one that could play the national top ten schools on fairly even terms. If that prospect was not in the offing then widespread support would not be forthcoming. Institutional loyalty in this area on the part of both students and alumni was thought to be a thing of the past.

So far the background of the alumni donating picture and two aspects of it have been described--no significant alumni interest or support for maintaining the football program existed at the time of its demise and thus not surprisingly no significant support was excited by the discontinuation or was withheld after the discontinuation. In fact at some schools the cessation of football was a definite boon to general fund raising. This third aspect is perhaps best illuminated by one fund raiser's echo of the statements of other fund raisers when he said that a number of "hard headed business types" felt that the school by discontinuing football was finally getting "its priorities in the right place." And now that these 'business types' knew that the school "couldn't sink their money in that rat-hole football" they gave liberally, the fund raiser said.

Officials involved in the fund raising process at some other schools said that although they could not be sure of isolating the many variables involved, they felt that some of the success of general fund raising projects that got underway at the same time football was given up was attributable to its abandonment. Since, as was noted earlier, football is usually discontinued at moments of severe financial crisis at a university, it is not surprising that the start of major fund raising drives often coincides with the discontinuation of football. Apparently also most colleges felt that the cessation of football would not be a major deterrent to fund raising.

A number of administrators also brought up two other positive financial effects that they felt may have had something to do with the abandonment of a costly football program. In both cases they wanted it clearly understood that they had no direct evidence or statements to back up their feelings, but nonetheless they suspected that the fact of football's discontinuation had helped their private institutions receive aid from the state and from private foundations. These officials felt that the discontinuation of a costly football program was often looked on by the state appropriations officials and by foundations as a prime example of good stewardship in the university or at least looked on as one example among many of good stewardship.

## IV

At many institutions the discontinuation of football results in an attempt, often successful, to excel or maintain excellence in another intercollegiate sport. Why this is so is one of the main subjects of this section. One fairly obvious reason involves the fact that football is looked on by many as the be-all and end-all of intercollegiate programs. One institution which discontinued its football program had for many years to issue assurances that it had not dropped its entire intercollegiate program. Thus excellence somewhere on the intercollegiate sports spectrum certainly helps to make sure that no one gets the impression that the institution was or is disinterested in intercollegiate competition (or athletic excellence) because it dropped football.

Hence the decision to build up an intercollegiate sport seems to be made as much for alumni and prospective students as it is for present students. But if the windfall for intercollegiate athletics appears to have past and future students uppermost in mind, the windfall for intramurals is devoted to the needs and wishes of present students. Administrators often say that the expanding of intramural facilities and instructional staff is just a response to avidly expressed student desires to participate in athletics. This response, the officers continue, would have been forthcoming in any event. If that is so, the discontinuation of football certainly seems in many cases to have accelerated the response and often to have broadened it as well.

This section is divided into four parts: basketball, the rest of the intercollegiate program, intramurals, and the experience of those institutions that resumed football.

At most schools where football is discontinued there is an immediate effort either to make certain that an already existing big-time basketball program is maintained or built up even further or to change a relatively low-profile basketball program into a big-time one. Usually the bigger time the football program was, the more emphasis placed on basketball after football's cessation. The hope is that the alumni can be assuaged about football's non-existence by being able to say, "We may not have football, but look at our basketball team."

Although a few schools gaze fondly and wistfully at the well-known examples of a couple of Catholic schools who discontinued football and whose basketball teams now support the rest of their athletic programs and manage besides to contribute year in and year out a $100,000 or so to general funds, most schools at best only expect their basketball team to be self-supporting. Even if the team is not self-supporting--the vast majority are not--the cost of big-time basketball is usually about one tenth of the cost of big-time football. The average big-time basketball program seems to have a net cost of between $20,000 and $60,000, with most programs closer to the lower figure.

Big-time basketball then for about one-tenth of the cost of football, and often less than that, is looked on by most of the institutions that dropped football to provide what the deceased football program was supposed to but couldn't, e.g., an intercollegiate team that can be competitive on a high level, national publicity, a focus for student interest, and a rallying point for alumni support. In the context of the last example it should be noted that some universities without football now arrange a homecoming weekend around basketball.

The demise of football often results in a windfall for the rest of the intercollegiate roster as well. Perhaps the most remarkable change occurred at one school where football was taking 85 per cent of the athletic budget. At that point the institution had a relatively big-time football team and four other intercollegiate teams that were low-profile, were rarely winning at that level, and were under-staffed and poorly participated in. With the discontinuation of football and the allocation of football costs to intercollegiate and intramural activities, the school now has ten well-stocked, well-attended, competitively successful intercollegiate programs.

The particular sport, besides basketball, of course, that seems to reap the most benefit from football's cessation is soccer. Soccer is seen as the fall sport that can at least in part substitute for the spectator interest football arouses. Occasionally there is a policy decision to recruit more heavily for soccer and occasionally the enlarged publicity soccer receives by default in the fall seems to cause more and better athletes to participate in it. Also even at a small academically elite school, when football was given up the athletic director to his own surprise found himself putting pressure on the soccer team to perform better because they had the center stage.

I mentioned earlier that what immediately impressed one about the list of schools that had discontinued football was the large number of big-time basketball powers on it. Not as obvious is the large number of schools on the list that are continually nationally ranked in soccer.

It should be noted also that at a few schools the demise of football has perhaps hastened an emphasis on hockey. Hockey at these schools is seen in the exact same light that basketball is at other schools that have dropped football.

Everywhere school officials talked about an overwhelming recent increase in students' desires to participate in some kind of physical activity. At many institutions the administration felt that by discontinuing football the college was making a choice between fulfilling the general student's limited interest in viewing football and his or her growing enthusiasm for participating in all sports. Thus these participatory wants affected and were affected by the departure of football on many campuses.

On the one hand, the heavy, often round the clock use of existing athletic facilities (8 A.M. to 2 A.M. for basketball courts, for instance, was not uncommon), and the multitude of requests for new programs and new facilities intensified some administrators' perceptions that football was getting too much of the college's "athletic" dollar. At some colleges the demands for and on participatory programs seems to have created the perception in the first place. It should be noted in passing that women's striving for equality of treatment seems to have played a large role in these perceptions. In any event, the many and expanding demands for participatory programs and facilities combined with what administrators saw as a slacking student interest in viewing the college's football team seems to have at least hastened the discontinuation of football on many campuses.

On the other hand, intramurals were affected by football even without the allocation of some of the funds that football previously received. At most colleges practice fields, equipment, locker rooms, and other facilities became available. Often the football stadium itself was eventually torn down and the site became playing fields and courts if it was not needed as a parking lot.

The most significant way that the discontinuation of football affected intramurals occurred, obviously, when administrators saw intramurals as the natural recipient of funds previously expended on football. As was noted earlier, the demise of football signaled the start of the building of new facilities and the improvement of old ones to be used principally for intramural and recreational endeavors. Perhaps only a little less important was that the discontinuation of football seemed on many campuses to allow the attitudes of administrators to change toward intramurals.

The change, of course, was primarily a matter of funds being made available, but also seemed to occur because of the rationale offered by most colleges for abandoning football. Since football was discontinued in part because it didn't satisfy what were thought to be the athletic interests of students, it seemed incumbent on its discontinuers to cater to whatever those interests were. Therefore at a number of campuses no longer were intramurals solely a matter of responding to vocal enough and widespread enough demands. The abandonment of football heralded a time when diverse student athletic and recreational interests were actively sought out and when new programs and new instructors were hired as well as a time when student demands did not have to be put off into the future.

As noted earlier twenty-nine of the 151 colleges that dropped football resumed it. Also a number of the remaining colleges--a guess would have to be around thirty--are now playing or have at one time resumed an intercollegiate football program but on a club level. Occasionally, as is remarked on below, that club program becomes a varsity one.

The resumptions may be said to fall into three basic categories. The first comprises those schools whose football discontinuation was the product of short term problems, e.g., injuries or manpower shortages or other troubles at the time of the Korean War. These colleges, about half of the twenty-nine, resumed football as usual when the problem disappeared. The "when" was almost always a year or two later.

The second category consists of those colleges which felt that their unsuccessful relatively big-time football program was overly ambitious for a school of their size. The program was too costly in terms of money and morality and had been engineered by ambitious coaches. These schools thought that they could satisfy their constituents by returning to a more modest football enterprise that was in line with the rest of their intercollegiate sports programs.

The third, by far the most interesting, category and one that occupies the remainder of this section, involves those colleges who had big-time or relatively big-time football teams and who had and have big-time basketball teams, whose discontinuations were the product of long term problems, e.g., finances and lack of student interest. The colleges in this last category, largely because of their big-time athletic reputation, at the point of discontinuation saw no viable middle ground for their institution's football team between big-time and non-existence. (The reasons involved in the decision not to try to salvage the big-time program were discussed earlier in the section on reasons for discontinuation.)

One major consideration behind the all or nothing philosophy was the thought that if student interest could not be aroused for a big-time program against many traditional rivals, how was it going to be aroused for a low-profile one against what were called "no-name" schools. This consideration revealed the kind of institutional ego that made the term "representative schedule" take on new meaning.

There were sporadic attempts made by students at most colleges that dropped football to have the college reinstate it. All colleges turned down these usually half-hearted suggestions by students (and occasionally by alumni still nostalgic for the past glories) easily and without causing any ripples. Varsity football continued to be recognized as too expensive by all associated with these campuses.

Without going into the history of how club football became a widespread, popular enterprise in the nineteen sixties, it is sufficient for me to say that with its start in the early sixties students had a better pitch to make to the administration. Also any enthusiasm for football had a form to channel itself into which in turn caused the enthusiasm to grow.

In this manner numerous football clubs were born. A group of enthusiastic students, primarily those interested in playing, got sufficiently widespread support from the rest of the students--represented often as the allotment of student activities fees to the club--to convince the administration that they could run their own program. The administration in response to this show of widespread student interest would give its sanction and would also usually give the club some minimal support like the use of facilities for free as a token of its approval of the students' enterprise. The students did do everything; they hired their own coaches, made up the schedules, acquired equipment, and most importantly, got bodies to play.

Some alumni (most with the hope that the club will lead to bigger and better things in football at their alma mater) made usually modest contributions at the beginning despite the fact that most colleges barred the active solicitation of alumni for fear it would interfere with other fund raising. In one unique instance an alumnus gave $5,000, a gift that allowed that club to survive another year. Invariably, however, after a few years, alumni contributions became negligible; the mere fact of football existing at their alma maters seems insufficient to win their support. Again, only a high level of existence seems capable of winning widespread and sustained support.

After an enthusiastic start that usually lasted through a generation of students involved in that start, i.e., four years, these club programs ran into financial trouble. Even if the team was winning on the field a combination of circumstances, e.g., waning student interest in what was no longer the new game in town, cross country treks that were, if not fiscally sound, at least a glamorous selling point to entice participants into a program that had one ingredient of the big-time, and irresponsibility that made cancellation on the day before a game a regular occurrence, caused club teams to get deeper and deeper in debt, a debt the university quietly assumed for a while.

The while ended and the crucial question eventually at a number of places where the club program went into considerable debt became--was the university going to continue to support the program without having control over what had usually come to be a mismanaged affair generating bad publicity for the college? At most schools the answer was to tell the club team that the debt the school had assumed to the club's creditors must be wiped out and so the club is sent back to the other students asking for even more support from student fees. The support is often denied. Also the impression gotten was that most club teams still functioning lead a tenuous year to year existence.

A few colleges answered the question by taking control of the program by placing it under athletic department auspices as a varsity intercollegiate team. These universities see the activity as capable of providing a worthwhile, enjoyable experience for a number of interested students (participants and spectators) at a reasonable cost. Most colleges, however, see that kind of commitment as starting the whole process of too much money for too little returns all over again. Moreover, the immediate cost, which most administrators felt stood a good chance of growing in order to keep up with an escalating competition, of twenty to forty thousand dollars seemed to most officials still too much for what they saw was gotten at other schools--a program that in the words of one official was "neither fish nor fowl nor good red herring."

Although a few hold out hope for their young and struggling programs, a few have already discontinued their resumptions. The initial all or nothing suspicions seem well-founded. It appears to be particularly difficult to find an attractive low-profile level to play football at and to get support for if you have a big-time program in other sports.

## V

The most significant thing about this section may be its brevity. The brevity speaks for the general lack of concern about the effect stopping football would have on the educational environment. Perhaps because almost no one associated the two readily, only a few results were seen. Two substantial issues were raised about big-time football programs nonetheless in connection with this topic. One had to do with morality and financial aid and the other with football's effect on academic priorities.

Before talking about the effect on morality and academic priorities some mention should be made of the effect of discontinuation on the football players themselves. What happened at most campuses indicates the special group that football players thought themselves to be in the educational community.

Every place I consulted said that they had honored their scholarship commitments to the football players for each of the years the player had remaining at the school. Nonetheless the vast majority of scholarship players, those with and without professional aspirations (athletic directors were surprised at the large number with aspirations), transferred if they thought they could play for another institution. The bigger time the program the more football players transferred to other institutions. In all discontinuation cases the NCAA immediately ruled that the one year sit out rule for transfers would be waived and almost invariably coaches acted as a clearing house for the players, getting them located at colleges, mostly those on the last year's schedule, that they felt were in need of the player's particular talents.

It also should be pointed out that the knowledge that the schools would honor their scholarships fully for their remaining years did not lessen the players' sense of disappointment and, in many cases, anger at the school for what was felt to be a betrayal. The players felt that the college had been less than responsible with them, having recruited them for a program that the college was unwilling to continue. At no college was the opposite reaction said to be at all widespread. No one, for instance, said that players felt glad because the discontinuation plus the retention of scholarships would allow them to concentrate on their studies.

The issue of morality overlapped with financial aid problems in three ways that were brought to my attention. All three, although not confined to football, made many school officials feel good about the discontinuation of football, simply because it usually involved more examples than all the other intercollegiate sports combined.

In the first case the question of providing athletes with more scholarship money than their family needs warranted seemed unfair to many. "Did an athlete contribute more to the school necessarily than a non-athlete?" was the query made bitterly by one financial aid director particularly upset at having to squeeze the resources of so many middle class families whose students were not athletes.

Another perhaps more immoral practice that football particularly exacerbated was the enrollment of minority players in non-athletic minority scholarship programs. This was done to make the cost of football appear less. Another effect it had, of course, was to usurp a source of funds that minority non-athletes had available to them.

The third problem is also one that is aggravated by football particularly. There are always those athletes on scholarship that become disinterested in athletics and decide to quit. Losing teams naturally make even more quit. At schools that try not to make a distinction between athletic and academic scholarships but do give scholarships to athletes, the financial aid officer usually ends up as the referee between an irate coach and a recalcitrant athlete. He reminds the former of the changing times and the latter of his responsibilities and of what got him into the institution in the first place and then curses the situation that makes one class of students special.

Not only were some financial aid officers happy to see football discontinued, but a number of other administrators were pleased. They were pleased because of the corrosive effects they saw football having on values. Again, the antipathy seems attributable mostly to the numbers involved with football since most of the same administrators were content to house a big-time basketball program. Some said that without football, without the focus on winning games on Saturday, it was much easier to keep academic work the high priority on campus. Moreover, the running of a "protective stable" for outstanding athletes and the academic compromises that that inevitably involved also helped skew value patterns in a bad way. In short, then the pleasure taken in football's abandonment resided principally in the fact that the average student was no longer confronted by a highly visible group of special students with special, difficult to justify, privileges.

When admissions were inquired about officers said that, as with many other events in this report, there were a number of variables involved and it was difficult to isolate the effect of discontinuing football. Almost all said, however, that the only noticeable effect was that no football players now applied. Almost all also seemed sure that giving up football had no other effect either negatively or positively on admissions.

## Attachment One: Presently Existing Senior Colleges That Have Discontinued Football Since 1939.

Legend: R--Resumed, if year is unknown then single question mark follows.
D.A.--Discontinued Again, Second Discontinuation is also noted by name of college in brackets next to the appropriate year.

1939--Depaul
1940--Birmingham Southern
Chicago; R--1969
Long Island University
Loyola of South
St. Joseph's, Pa.
1941--St. Mary's, Tex.
1942--American U.
Gonzaga
King, Tenn.
La Salle
Mercer
Providence
St. Anselm's
St. Mary's, Mich.
Spring Hill
1943--Creighton
Manhattan
Regis
1947--Lawrence Tech
1948--Centenary
Lambuth
Oglethorpe
1949--Alliance
Cumberland
1950--Canisius
Huntington
Oklahoma City
Portland
Rio Grande
Rollins
St. Louis
Steubenville
1951--Arkansas College
Atlantic Christian
Assumption
Catholic U.
CCNY
Corpus Christi; R--1954 D.A.--1967
Detroit Tech
Duquesne
1951--East Texas Baptist
Gannon
Georgetown, D.C.; R--1970
Glassboro State; R--1964
Hartwick
High Point
Lemoyne
Lycoming; R--1954
Milligan
Mount St. Mary's
McKendree
Navada at Reno; R--1952
New England; R--?, D.A.--1973
Niagara
St. Mary's, Calif.; R--?
Southwestern, Tenn.; R--1952
Southwestern, Tex.
Tillotson (now Huston-Tillotson)
Tusculum
William Penn; R--1953
Washington College
West Virginia Wesleyan; R--1953
1952--Aquinas
Clarkson
Erskine
Loyola, Calif.
Rider
St. Bonaventure
St. Martin's
Samuel Huston (now Huston-Tillotson)
San Francisco; R--1959, D.A.--1972
Shaw; R--1953
1953--Aurora
Bethel, Tenn.
Cedarville
Davis and Elkins; R--1955, D.A.--1972
Georgetown, Ky.; R--1955
New York University
Santa Clara; R--1959
Union, Tenn.
Westmar; R--1954

- 1954--Adelphi; R--ca. 1969, D.A.--1972
  - Case Tech; R--1955
  - Quincy
  - St. Francis, Pa.
  - St. Michael's, Vt.
  - Washington and Lee; R--1955
  - York
- 1955--Fordham; R--1970
  - St. Mary's, Minn.
- 1956--Brooklyn College; R--ca. 1969
  - Hendrix; R--1957, D.A.--1961
  - William Carey
- 1957--Lewis College
  - Morris Harvey
  - Stetson
- 1960--Brandeis
  - Leland
  - Loras
  - St. Ambrose
  - Xavier, La.
- 1961--Denver
  - Hawaii; R--1962
  - (Hendrix)
  - Lincoln
  - Marquette
  - Paul Quinn
  - Scranton
  - Texas College
  - Tougaloo
- 1962--Azusa (now Azusa-Pacific)
  - (Davis and Elkins)
  - Pepperdine
  - So. California College
  - U. of San Diego; R--1972
  - Westminster, Utah; R--1965
- 1963--Hardin-Simmons
  - St. Benedict's
  - St. Vincent's, Pa.
- 1964--King's, Pa.
  - Paine
- 1965--Claflin
  - Detroit
  - Dillard
  - L.A. Pacific (now Azusa-Pacific R--?)
  - Philander Smith
  - Rust
- 1966--St. Augustine's
- 1967--Benedict
  - (Corpus Christi)
  - George Washington U.
  - Jarvis Christian
  - College of Ozarks
- 1968--Edward Waters
- 1969--Allen
  - Univ. of Cal. at San Diego
  - Louisiana College
  - George Fox
  - Wiley
  - Western Reserve (now Case-Western)
- 1971--Bradley
  - SUNY at Buffalo
  - Lake Forest; R--1972
  - Univ. of Cal. at Santa Barbara
- 1972--(Adelphi)
  - Haverford
  - New Mexico Highlands; R--1974
  - Northern Montana
  - Northwood
  - (San Francisco)
  - Sonoma State
- 1973--Drexel
  - (New England College)
  - Xavier, Ohio
- 1974--Samford U.

Attachment Two: Notes on the Geographical Distribution and on the Sizes of the Colleges on the Discontinuation List.

The 151 colleges are distributed geographically in the following manner: 4% are in NCAA District I (New England); 25% in District II (Mid-Atlantic States); 26% in District III (The South); 14% in District IV (Mid-Eastern States); 6% in District V (The Mid-Western States); 10% in District VI (The Southwest); 3% in District VII (The Rocky Mountains); and 12% in District VIII, (The Far West).

36% of the colleges have enrollments of under 1,000. 31% have between 1,001 and 2,000 students. 17% have enrollments between 2,100-4,000. 10% have 4,001-6,500 students. 6% have enrollments of over 6,500. All but one of the publicly supported schools are in the last two categories. The church-related colleges fall most frequently among the smaller schools, while the independent colleges are the ones dispersed most evenly on the spectrum.

In District III, the section of the country which has the highest percentage of discontinuations, the schools are predominantly small. 60% have enrollments of under 1,000 and 95% have fewer than 2,000 students. Moreover, approximately half of the southern schools are black, church affiliated colleges. No southern or southwestern college with a big-time or relatively big-time program has, to my knowledge, dropped that program with the exception of one small publicly supported southwestern school which has announced that its program was wildly over-ambitious for its size.

The other sections of the country, however, all contain schools that have dropped big-time and relatively big-time programs. District II and District IV contain by far the most institutions that have done so and thus were the Districts most consulted in this report.